DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 463 SO 005 631

AUTHOR Marker, Gerald W.; Mehlinger, Howard D.
TITLE Report of the Social Studies Field Agent Training Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ. Foundation, Bloomington.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 72
GRANT OEG-0-70-2023(725)
NOTE 191p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Adoption (Ideas); *Diffusion; *Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Evaluation; Program Descriptions; Projects; *Social Studies; *Teacher Education; Teacher Experience; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Interns; Training Objectives; Training Techniques
IDENTIFIERS *Field Agent Training Program

ABSTRACT

The Social Studies Field Agent Training Program was a two year experiment supported by the Office of Education and the Ford Foundation. The primary goal of the program was to test the feasibility of employing specially trained social studies teachers, who were referred to as social studies field agents, to increase the rate of the diffusion of innovations in social studies. The report includes the rationale for the program, descriptions of the training and follow-up years, results of a third-party evaluation, and recommendations for future programs. Evaluative data supports the conclusions that social studies field agents can be recruited, trained, and can increase the rate of diffusion and adoption of social studies innovations. The personalities of field agents and the degree of local commitment to change appear to be major variables in the success of inside change agents, such as the field agents. Follow-up support for persons in such roles also appears to be important to their success. A related document is ED 064 199. (Author)

ED 076463

Final Report

Project No. 5252
Contract No. OEG-0-70-2023(725)

Gerald W. Marker
Howard D. Mehlinger
Indiana University Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES FIELD AGENT TRAINING PROGRAM

October, 1972

SO 005 631

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Educational Personnel Development and Communications Branch

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076463

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final Report

Project No. 5252
Contract No. OEG-0-70-2023(725)

Gerald W. Marker
Howard D. Mehlinger
Indiana University Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES FIELD AGENT TRAINING PROGRAM

October, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Educational Personnel Development and Communications Branch

Final Report

Project No. 5252
Contract No. OEG-0-70-2023(725)

REPORT OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES FIELD AGENT TRAINING PROGRAM

Gerald W. Marker, Co-director
Howard D. Mehlinger, Co-director

Indiana University Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

October, 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Educational Personnel Development and Communications Branch

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Abstract	iii
	Acknowledgments	iv
I.	Introduction	1
	The Problem	1
	Characteristics of Persons Selected	10
II.	The Training Year	13
	The Academic Program	13
	Internship	14
	Special Seminars	16
	Special Activities	24
	Unexpected Developments	28
III.	The Follow-up Year	31
	Importance of Follow-up Year	31
	Refresher/Diagnosis Workshops	37
	NCSS Denver Convention	43
	School Visits	45
	Telephone Consultations	46
	Newsletter and Cassettes	47
	Consultants	49
	Diffusing the Field Agent Program	49
	Summary	51
IV.	Evaluation	53
	Introduction	53
	Field Agent Ratings of Program Objectives	54
	Field Agent Evaluation of the Training Program	59
	Field Agent Self-Assessed Impact	67
	Teacher and Administrator Questionnaries and Telephone Interviews	75
	Summary of Site Visits	100
V.	Summary Evaluation of the Social Studies Field Agent Project by the Evaluation Team	125
VI.	Lessons for the Future	131
	Selecting Participants	131
	The Training Program	132
	Follow-up Support	133

A P P E N D I C E S

A. Letter of Invitation to Apply

B. Letter of Agreement

C. Index to Field Agent Information Tape #2

D. Index to Field Agent Information Tape #3

E. Spring '72 Letter to Administrator

F. Objective Rating Sheet

G. Field Agent Rating Sheet

H. Teacher Questionnaire

I. Administrator Questionnaire

J. Biographical Data on the Field Agents

K. Informal Contact Report Form

L. Formal Contact Report Form

M. Revised Informal Contact Form

N. Results: Formal Contact Forms

O. Results: Informal Contact Forms

ABSTRACT

The Social Studies Field Agent Training Program was a two year experiment supported by funds from the United States Office of Education and the Ford Foundation. The primary goal of the program was to test the feasibility of employing specially trained social studies teachers, who were referred to as social studies field agents, to increase the rate of the diffusion of innovations in social studies.

The following report contains the rationale for the program, descriptions of the training and follow-up years, results of a third-party evaluation, and recommendations for future programs.

The evaluative data support the conclusions that social studies field agents can be recruited, trained, and can increase the rate of diffusion and adoption of social studies innovations. The personalities of field agents and the degree of local commitment to change appear to be major variables in the success of inside change agents, such as the field agents. Follow-up support for persons in such roles also appears to be important to their success.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Diffusion projects by their very nature involve many persons. It is impossible to thank each individual who in some way made a contribution to the work of these past two years.

Our special thanks go to Mr. Donald F. Sandberg, Program Officer of the Ford Foundation. A grant of $39,542.00 from the Ford Foundation provided support for the two doctoral associates who were an integral part of the program, made possible the purchase of kit materials for each field agent, and supported various diffusion efforts about the program itself. Mr. Sandberg was an early backer of the field agent idea, and his efforts are greatly appreciated.

Ms. Carole Hahn and Mr. James Dick made major contributions to the program. In their rcles as doctoral associates, they worked daily with the field agents during the training year and they angaged in follow-up support activities during the 1971-72 academic year. In addition, Ms. Hahn was a major contributor to this report and will be engaged in continued support activities during the 1972-73 school year with funds made available by James Becker's Social Studies Diffusion Project, based at Indiana University.

Numerous faculty members made instructional contributions to the program. Professor Alice Jwaideh taught a seminar especially designed for the field agents. Professor Lee Ehman's graduate seminar gathered considerable baseline data about the field agents and, along with Professors Robert Barr, Judy Gillespie, John Patrick, and Frederick R. Smith, Professor Ehman supervised field agent intern activities.

Mr. Thomas E. Brown, Assistant Coordinator for School Social Studies, was instrumental in arranging numerous field experiences for the field agents and, along with Ms. Hahn, will provide support for the field agents during the 1972-73 academic year.

Deans David L. Clark and Egon Guba of the Indiana University School of Education provided a theoretical basis for the program through their writings on change as well as their continued support for the program during its operation. Mr. Ray Martin and Mr. Gary Drummond were generous in helping us over the rough spots in regard to contract administration.

Countless publishing companies graciously furnished materials for the field agents—materials which, as documented by this report, played a vital part in the daily work of the field agents.

Finally, we thank the field agents and their colleagues. The field agents tolerated our programmatic blunders with understanding and good humor and their colleagues were most generous in responding to interviews and evaluation forms. In the final analysis this program was shaped more by the eleven field agents than by any other factor, and we believe its success is a lasting tribute to their difficult and sometimes thankless work.

Gerald W. Marker, Co-Director
Howard D. Mehlinger, Co-Director

I. INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Education has been notorious as one of the institutions of American society that is slowest to change. In visiting their children's schools, parents find little has changed since their own school days. The lack of change, however, does not come from a lack of new knowledge and availability of innovations in education. Rather, the problem is in the slow rate of diffusion of innovations through educational systems. In numerous studies, Paul R. Mort and his associates at Columbia University have found that "the average American school lags twenty-five years behind the best practice."* Since the launching of Sputnik, it appears that diffusion of new programs in math, science, and foreign languages--as well as technological innovations like programmed instruction—has been more rapid. Now we are hearing complaints both that some schools are "still in the Middle Ages," and that other schools "go hog wild over anything that's new no matter how good or bad it is." Havelock and others have spoken of the need for knowledge dissemination and wise utilization of the innovations that

---

* Paul R. Mort, 1953, as reported in Everett M. Rogers and F. Floyd Shoemaker, COMMUNICATION OF INNOVATIONS: A CROSS CULTURAL APPROACH. New York: The Free Press, 1971, p. 59.

are produced by the research and development agencies.*

The need for knowledge dissemination and utilization has been particularly acute in social studies education in the past ten years. Increased efforts in research and development generated new assumptions about good teaching and learning and new products that are based on those assumptions. However, it looked as if only a small percentage of social studies teachers would be using "the new social studies" products, which teach social science concepts, generalizations, and problem solving skills. Unfortunately, only those individuals who were already tuned in to the social studies education communication channels and who happened to be in a situation with all the necessary supports for change seemed likely to adopt the innovative programs.

Reporting new developments in journals that are read by a relatively few people, who alone cannot promote significant changes, and relying on publishers representatives to promote the changes contained in the new products were simply not enough to bring about significant change in the majority of social studies classrooms.

---

* Ronald G. Havelock. PLANNING FOR INNOVATIONS THROUGH DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE. Institute for Social Research. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. pp. 1-1, 1-2.

In 1959 Indiana University established a Coordinator for School Social Studies whose charge was to improve the teaching of social studies in the schools of Indiana. The Coordinator spent much of his time informing social studies teachers of alternative products and ideas, demonstrating some of the innovations in the schools and assisting local people to choose among those possibilities that seemed to them most promising. Most of those contacts were of a one-or two-day nature, often with frustratingly few results. While there are many diffusion activities, particularly at the awareness-interest stages, which lend themselves to one day contacts, there are many others, especially at the installation stage, that require sustained attention.

During the same time, the staff of the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University was becoming aware of a need for systematic attention to diffusion and installation problems associated with their development activities. While conducting the national Civics Dissemination Institutes, the co-directors, Marker and Mehlinger, were further persuaded that schools wanted help in installing some of the ideas and products of "the new social studies."

It was becoming increasingly clear that an important

element in the change process was missing. Someone with a detailed knowledge of the local situation and of social studies innovations was needed to remain on the scene to nurture and encourage the trial of new materials and procedures. It was this need which led to the idea that what was needed were field agents in social studies similar in function to the agricultural extension agents.

Choosing a Direction

In 1969, Professor Mehlinger conducted a study for the Ford Foundation on the problem of diffusion of innovation in the social studies. The study sought answers to four questions:

1. Is there a need for "field agents" in social studies?

2. Are there people who could be recruited to fill the field agent role if the need is established?

3. If people were recruited as field agents, what kind of institutional affiliations would be most desirable?

4. If there is a need, if field agents could be recruited, and if they could establish an appropriate institutional base, is it likely that the schools would pay for field agent services once they were available and once the services could be demonstrated to be useful and effective?

During his two-month study, Professor Mehlinger interviewed nearly forty persons, including university faculty members, school teachers and administrators, U.S. Office

of Education personnel, foundation officials, and individuals currently engaged in social studies research, development, and dissemination. All of them agreed that it is very difficult to reach classroom teachers and school administrators with information about current developments in the social studies and that current efforts to disseminate and to demonstrate innovations were mostly ineffective. Some noted that the transmission of information should flow in both directions. While teachers need information about efforts of researchers and developers, the latter must become more aware than in the past of the concerns of social studies teachers and school administrators.

Indiana University seemed to be the logical institution to pilot a social studies field agent program. The Coordinator's Office, the Development Center, the summer NSF Institutes, and the large social studies teacher education program at Indiana University were all devoted to improving social studies education. Since the intent of the field agent program was to diffuse innovations in social studies and not to change the school as an institution, Clark and Guba's Research, Development, Diffusion and Adoption Model (R,D,D, and A),* with modifications,

---

* Egon Guba. "Development, Diffusion and Evaluation" in Eidell, T.L., and Kitchell, Joanne M. (eds.), KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, Eugene, Oregon: University Council on Educational Administration and Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968.

seemed most appropriate as a basis for the program. The social studies field agents were to engage in dissemination and adoption activities. As the program progressed it seemed wise to place more emphasis on user needs and the local environment in which change was to occur than had been suggested by the RDD & A Model.

Planning the form of a field agent training program was influenced by the constraints of the funding agency as well as by a model of the change process. It was necessary that field agents meet the University requirements for an M.A.T. degree and that they take the twelve hours needed for a major in political science. Instruction experiences related to change and to "the new social studies" replaced the regular M.A.T. electives.

The primary short term objective of the field agent program was to train a group of eleven social studies teachers who would return to their schools and serve as field agents for their geographic regions. Specifically the training program would:

1. Increase the participants' knowledge of the basic concepts, principles, and analytic skills in history and the social sciences.
2. Familiarize participants with a wide range of curriculum materials and teaching strategies.
3. Introduce participants to the many university resources upon which they could draw after

their return to the field.

4. Give participants an opportunity to participate in the development of curriculum materials.

5. Give participants experience in planning and conducting diffusion workshops and conferences.

6. Teach participants principles and generalizations regarding the change process enabling them to apply this learning to their local settings.

7. Encourage the development of attitudes supportive of innovation and change, e.g., open-mindedness, flexibility, tolerance of ambiguity, rational decision-making.

The long-term objectives of the program were to:

1. Demonstrate that social studies field agents can be recruited and trained.

2. Provide a training and utilization model for other colleges and universities.

3. Broaden and strengthen the social studies education program at Indiana University.

4. Assist the university in more adequately serving the needs of the schools in its region of influence.

In late March, 1970, as soon as word was received that the program had been funded, a brochure was prepared describing the program and urging interested and qualified persons to apply. This brochure was sent to the mailing list of the newsletter sponsored by the Office of the Coordinator for Social Studies, entitled, News and Notes on the Social Sciences, which reaches about 1,200 teachers, administrators, and libraries; and to officials of state educational depart-

ments in Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, Illinois, and Indiana. (This territory covered all school systems within a three hundred mile radius of Indiana University.) Each chief state school officer (i.e., state superintendent) was sent a batch of fifty copies to be passed on to interested schools, and copies were also sent to state social studies supervisors. In addition, the Social Studies Coordinator and other faculty members distributed information about the program wherever they traveled during the recruitment period. (See Appendix item A.)

There were a number of requirements that undoubtedly reduced considerably the number of interested teachers who actually applied. First, they were to apply only if their participation in such a program, entailing their absence from their jobs, was approved both by their principal and by their superintendent. Moreover, the latter administrators had to make certain commitments to the program. They had to promise to support the field agent after his return to the school by adjusting his teaching load in order to give him released time to work as a field agent; to facilitate his attendance at national and state social studies conventions; to attend follow-up workshops at Indiana University; and to try to generally provide whatever financial and administrative assistance the field agent would need to carry out his objectives. A "statement of

intent" outlining these commitments had to be signed by both the principal and the superintendent of each applicant in order for him to be considered. (See Appendix item B.)

A total of thirty-four applications were received from prospective trainees. The applications were carefully screened in an attempt to seek bright, energetic young social studies teachers or supervisors who wished to take a one-year sabbatical to acquire new skills in social studies. The following criteria were used in an attempt to select applicants who:

1. Were social studies teachers or supervisors in a school system within a three hundred mile radius of Bloomington, Indiana.
2. Could demonstrate previous academic achievement that would predict success in the M.A.T. program (who were capable of being admitted to the I.U. Graduate School).
3. Had demonstrated leadership traits in their own schools.
4. Possessed other personal qualities that suggested they would be effective as field agents.

On the basis of these criteria, the number of prospective trainees was reduced to sixteen. Of these, fourteen applicants came to Bloomington for personal interviews, and the eleven field agents were selected from that group.

Characteristics of Persons Selected

The eleven trainees represented the states of Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, West Virginia, and Indiana. Those from Indiana were from Indianapolis, Gary, Marion, Mount Vernon, Columbus, Lawrence, and Wabash. They were teachers of a variety of social studies subjects, including government, civics, humanities, citizenship, economics, American history, geography, non-Western studies, social problems, comparative political systems, sociology, social dynamics, world history, and international relations. Five of them already had master's degrees, and several others had already done some graduate study.

Four of the trainees had served as chairmen of social studies departments, and one as acting chairman. Five were already members of the National Council for the Social Studies. The trainees were all relatively young, ranging in age from twenty-two to thirty-two. Most of them had been active in several school activities, including coaching in sports and serving as advisors to student government, yearbook, drama clubs, honors programs, and work affairs clubs.

In addition to the eleven field agents, two doctoral associates were selected to assist with the program.*

*Carole Hahn and James Dick were selected as the two doctoral associates.

Both were advanced students in social studies education who had shown an interest in field agent type activities. It was intended that they would get experience in doing in-service work with social studies teachers and, hopefully, would be interested in duplicating the field agent program in other universities where they might be employed upon graduation.

II. THE TRAINING YEAR

The Academic Program

All of the trainees in the field agent program were enrolled in the Social Studies M.A.T. program and received a Social Studies M.A.T. degree upon completion of their year of training. The academic program began in September, 1970, and ended in August, 1971. During the first semester, the participants were enrolled in nine hours of history and/or social science, a one-hour internship, and a special three-hour seminar dealing with "Improving the Teaching of Social Studies" (R519) taught by Professor Marker. They were counseled in their selection of history and social science courses to insure that they enrolled in courses emphasizing social science inquiry.

During the spring semester, the trainees were again enrolled in nine hours of history and/or social science, another one-hour internship, and a three-hour seminar on "Sociological Aspects of Educational Diffusion" (R670) taught by Professor Alice Jwaideh. The program of studies for the 1971 Summer Session included six hours of history and/or social science, a one-hour internship, and a three-hour seminar entitled "Practicum in Diffusion Techniques" (R590) taught jointly by Professors Marker and Jwaideh.

Thus by the completion of the formal training program, participants had completed the following hours of course work:

Political Science	12 semester hours
Other Social Sciences and History	12 semester hours
Special Seminars	9 semester hours
Internships	3 semester hours
TOTAL:	36 semester hours

Internship Program

The internship program rotated four participants per semester through those university agencies that could provide direct, practical experience relevant to the tasks to be performed by the field agents upon returning to their schools. Thus, each trainee spent one semester as an intern in each of the following:

1) The Social Studies Development Center where he received instruction and practice in development.

2) The social studies teacher education program which enabled him to participate in the training of pre-service teachers.

3) The office of the Coordinator for School Social Studies which provided him with opportunities to do in-service work with social studies teachers in Indiana.

Several field agents had some unique experiences during their internships. During his internship in the Development Center, one field agent developed a game, Escape, that deals with housing segregation. The game was pub-

lished in Social Education (volume 35, number 7, page 746).

Another field agent and the two doctoral associates accompanied Gerald Marker on two trips to evaluate the social studies program at a high school near Jamestown, New York. It gave the group the opportunity to establish criteria for evaluation, to make appropriate observations, and to work with local personnel in making recommendations for program improvement.

While doing his internship with the Coordinator's office, another field agent wrote an article, "Dangerous Parallels and the Classroom Study of International Relations," which was published in News and Notes on the Social Sciences (Spring, 1971).

Four other field agents put on an in-service program on "Maps and Globe Skills and Individualizing Instruction" in Gary, Indiana, in response to a request that was made of the Social Studies Coordinator's Office. The session was attended by about seventy upper elementary and junior high school teachers. Through the Coordinator's internship, other field agents put on a program on "Questioning Skills" at a meeting of the Central Indiana Council

for the Social Studies in Indianapolis. The field agents were active at the Indiana Council for the Social Studies convention. Several field agents conducted a session on the uses of videotape in social studies and two others set up a "film festival." They all took turns "manning" a booth for the ERIC Social Studies/Social Science Clearing House in the exhibit hall.

Most of the field agents made trips with the Assistant Social Studies Coordinator to observe social studies instruction in Indiana schools.

Special Seminars

The three special seminars enrolled only the eleven field agents and were designed specifically for their needs. These seminars focused directly upon the various kinds of skills and knowledge that the participants would need in order to perform the field agent function.

S519: Improving the Teaching of Social Studies

The first special course taken by the field agents during their training year was "Improving the Teaching of High School Social Studies." This course was included in the training program in order to achieve multiple goals. First, it was apparent from their applications that some of the field agents had only a limited acquaintance with the nature

of the new social studies. If the field agents were to serve as demonstrators of the new materials, they would have to understand and practice the required behavior. It was also assumed that with an understanding of the substance of the "revolution" in social studies instruction would come a commitment to the reform movement and the materials which play such an important role in it. The first goal of the course, then, was to develop a thorough understanding of the new social studies materials and teaching methods.

A second goal of the course was to engage students in many of the same activities which they might use in in-service sessions upon their return to their home districts. For example, when performance objectives were the topic for study, the students were required to learn how to write and use such objectives in a manner similar to that which they could employ the following year. A similar approach was followed with respect to other aspects of the inquiry approach, including the sequencing and teaching of concepts, hypothesis formulation and validation, and value analysis and clarification.

A third goal of the course was to acquaint the students with a wide range of social studies materials and the components of an "awareness net" which would enable them

to stay abreast of future developments in the field. Students were given the opportunity to apply the Curriculum Materials Analysis System to most of the new curriculum packages and their reports were duplicated and exchanged. Various activities introduced the field agents to persons who could serve as continuing sources of information about developments in social studies, e.g., James Becker, who at that time was the National Director of the Foreign Policy Association's School Services Division; Robert Barr, Chairman of the National Council for the Social Studies Publications Committee; and Lee Anderson, Director of the American Political Science Association's Political Science Education Project. The seminar also included sessions on the location of available materials, such as the use of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).

Finally, another goal of the course was to introduce the field agents to some of the skills and knowledge that was somewhat peculiar to their role as inside change agents. Early in the course the various models of change were introduced, such as the RDD & A Model, the Social Interaction Model, and the Problem-Solver Model. A modified version of the Havelock Diagnostic Model was employed by each of the field agents in analyzing the needs and characteristics of his local school setting. Some class sessions were devoted to early planning of the kits of materials which

each field agent assembled and took with him when he returned to his school. Students also role-played some of the situations which it was anticipated they would encounter, e.g., trying to convince a reluctant colleague that inquiry materials were worth trying.

R670: Sociological Aspects of Diffusion

The seminar on "Sociological Aspects of Educational Diffusion" began with an analysis by each field agent of the roles which he expected to perform upon his return to his school system. This was followed by a study of the literature dealing with the role of the change agent in education and the factors that have been found by research to be related to change agent success. Later in the semester, a week was devoted to role-playing sessions in which the field agents were assigned the roles of various members of a school faculty holding specified attitudes toward the new social studies. The member playing the role of the field agent had to try to persuade his "colleagues" to try the new curriculum materials.

Topics covered through lectures, readings, and discussions included the following:

1. Diffusion: elements in the diffusion process, the adoption process, innovation decisions, adopter categories, characteristics of innovations, types of innovations, models of the diffusion process.

2. Individual variables relevant to diffusion: personality characteristics, including confidence and self-esteem, values, needs, authoritarianism, etc.; past experiences; information-seeking patterns; attitudes.

3. Interpersonal and group influences: interpersonal relationships; participation in decision-making; group cohesiveness; conformity and social support; social integration; similarity; status; group norms.

4. Institutional and organizational variables: educational institutions as social systems, including the role of superintendents, principals, teachers, school boards, parents, students, etc.; inter-role relationships; institutional barriers to educational change; and applications from research findings dealing with organizational change.

5. Political and economic aspects of change: including the role of government agencies, the role of community power structures and interest groups, and the role of new economic developments such as accountability and performance contracting.

Each participant selected a topic of special interest to him on which he did research and reported his findings to the rest of the class.

One session was devoted to the use of media techniques by change agents. A member of the university's Division of Instructional Systems Technology gave a series of demonstrations on the preparation of audio-visual support materials.

R590: Practicum in Diffusion Techniques

The "Practicum on Diffusion Techniques" was devoted mainly to the use of various kinds of group techniques applied to issues of concern to the field agents, an overview of educational evaluation, the planning of a series of in-service training programs, and the development by each participant of a detailed plan for a diffusion/adoption campaign in his own school system.

A list of the group techniques covered, together with the particular content employed in conjunction with each technique, is given below.

Technique	Content
Small-group discussions	Reasons why teachers should try new social studies materials
Huddle method (2 sessions)	(a) Problems to be anticipated in use of new materials, and kinds of help field agents can provide (b) Things to do and not to do in conducting demonstration lessons
Buzz groups	Analysis of the primary characteristics of each set of curriculum materials
Panel discussions	"Divisibility" of the inquiry materials
Interrogator panels	The role(s) of the field agents
Committee hearings	Defense by each trainee of the main set of materials he will be diffusing

Technique	Content
Large-group discussions	Evaluation data on the new social studies materials; teachers' and students' reactions
Brainstorming (5 sessions)	Planning of workshops and in-service programs on: a. Evaluation of inquiry skills b. Performance objectives c. Games and simulations d. Questioning techniques e. Values and value clarification

The other major project for the Diffusion Techniques Practicum was the preparation by each field agent of a detailed plan for a diffusion/adoption campaign. This plan, on which the trainees worked for about a month toward the end of the training program, included the following components, together with a rationale for each component:

1. Analysis of the innovation itself, including its background, purposes, primary characteristics, advantages, evidence of effectiveness, persons for whom appropriate, teacher-training requirements, management considerations (cost, funding, etc.), divisibility, physical facilities needed, preparation required, assistance available, problems that may arise in its use, and possible solutions to these problems.

2. Selection of the audiences to be reached, including administrators, teachers' organizations, school board members, community groups, parents, etc.

3. Analysis of each audience group in terms of its major characteristics, including attitudes, values, needs.

4. Selection of the optimum diffusion strategy for each group (e.g., rational, didactic, psychological, economic, political, authority, value, etc.).

5. Determination of appropriate content and themes for each group (e.g., financial, child-centered, teacher-centered, community-centered, educational "currency", leadership.

6. Selection of media to be used for the various audiences (e.g., slides, filmstrips, transparencies, motion pictures, newsletters, brochures, articles, speeches, etc.).

7. Determination of the optimum timing, i.e., stages and scheduling of the campaign for each audience.

8. Selection of appropriate techniques (a) for diffusing the innovation (e.g., telling, showing, helping, involving, training, intervening); (b) for involving persons affected by the change; (c) for building relationships with individuals; (d) for utilizing group interaction; (e) for dealing with key persons; (f) for dealing with opposition; (g) for using outside experts; and (h) for conducting demonstrations.

9. Installation of the innovation, including plans for limited trials, funding, provision of necessary materials and equipment, selection of personnel, provision of necessary training, distribution of responsibilities, and establishment of reward system.

10. Evaluation and modification of the innovation to meet local needs.

11. Follow-up activities.

12. Evaluation and modification of the diffusion/adoption campaign.

These plans were prepared in consultation with Professor Marker and were evaluated and critiqued by three faculty members before being returned to the field agents. Some of the plans were extremely detailed and complete, running up to about fifty pages in length. In cases where the trainee would be returning to a new or changed position

or school situation, the plans of necessity contained certain gaps which were to be filled in upon the field agent's return to his community.

Special Activities

Evening Seminars. In addition to the formal course-work and internships, a variety of special activities and programs were arranged for the trainees. These included a series of evening seminars, often featuring guest speakers who dealt with topics relevant to the field agent program. Resource persons brought in for these seminars included Mary Lou Nay, who talked about Sociological Resources for the Social Studies Project; Professor Jack Fraenkel of San Francisco State University, one of the developers of the Taba materials for elementary social studies; Professor Dorothy Skeel, who reviewed projects and trends in elementary social studies; Professor James Mahan of the Center for Innovation in Teacher Education at Indiana University, who spoke on his experiences in curriculum installation while he was with the ERIE Regional Educational Laboratory; and Professor John Brown of the I.U. Urban Education program, who spoke on the special problems of urban schools.

One special seminar was devoted to a study of the World History Project, and four members of the project's staff

participated. At another session, representatives of the Ginn Publishing Company described an urban multi-media kit for junior high school social studies programs. The field agent trainees themselves conducted several of the evening seminars, dealing with such topics as role-playing, problems of slow learners, games and simulations, and the teaching of international affairs.

The trainees participated in two sessions on interaction analysis systems, and received training in the use of the Flanders system from Mr. Lee Kern, an expert in this field.

Field Kit Development. At the beginning of the training program, supplementary funds were obtained from the Ford Foundation for the development by each trainee of a "field kit" of innovative materials to take back with him to his local school district. The purpose of the kit was to support the trainee's efforts to promote the diffusion of innovations in social studies. The Ford grant allowed for the expenditure by each field agent of $500.00 for this purpose.

It was originally expected that the field agents might wish to develop some materials themselves to supplement those which were commercially available. To assist them in accomplishing this goal, two AV consultants were assigned

to help them. Although a few of the trainees did produce original filmstrips, slides, and transparencies, it turned out that because of time pressures, most of the money allotted for kit development was used to purchase or duplicate materials that had already been developed.

Kinds of things which the trainees acquired for their kits included:

1. Cassette tape recorders
2. Sample copies of exemplary social studies curriculum materials
3. Copies of outstanding new social studies textbooks
4. Books on the change process and diffusion techniques
5. Supplementary reading materials for use in teaching social studies
6. Copies of games and simulations
7. Copies of transparencies
8. Materials on some of the special skills needed in teaching the new social studies, such as preparing performance objectives, value analysis and clarification, questioning techniques and hypothesis formation.

Administrators' Conference. Early in the spring semester, administrators from the field agents' school districts gathered in Bloomington for a two-day conference with the trainees and IU faculty members involved in the training program. The school personnel who attended the conference included superintendents, principals, curriculum directors, department chairmen, and teachers. There was at least one administrator from each of the trainees' school systems, and each of them was urged to bring with them one or more social studies teachers

interested in change.

The program included talks by the Dean of the School of Education and by the Co-directors of the training program, a panel discussion by four of the field agents, a report on the baseline evaluation data obtained through field interviews at the trainees' schools, and brainstorming sessions on how to maximize the impact of the field agents upon their return to their school systems. An important effect of this conference was that a number of the administrators publicly committed themselves with regard to ways in which they would support the field agents during the coming school year, such as giving them released time for field agent activities.

NSF Social Studies Orientation Conference. Representatives from seven publishers of new social studies curriculum materials came to Bloomington for a special twelve-day conference during the summer of 1971, and the field agents were invited to attend their talks and demonstrations. This conference, which was sponsored by the National Science Foundation, was designed primarily for the purpose of introducing curriculum directors, supervisors, and principals to some of the latest social studies development projects.

Other Activities. In addition to the above

seminars and meetings, various field agents attended several other conferences during their formal training year. These included a conference on international education held in Evansville, Indiana; a dissemination conference on Man: A Course of Study held at Ohio State University; and the Indiana Council for the Social Studies Annual Convention at Indianapolis. The field agents and Professor Marker also visited their home schools during the spring semester.

Unexpected Developments

There were several factors that influenced the training program which had not been anticipated during the planning stage. It had been assumed that the field agents were themselves master teachers and therefore would not need a methods class and micro-teaching experiences. It was planned in the social studies seminar that the field agents would become familiar with new social studies materials which they in turn could bring to the attention of other teachers. However, it developed that the field agents felt a need to master the abilities to write behavioral objectives, to teach a concept, and to conduct a problem-solving lesson themselves. They frequently expressed a desire for such instruction and practice and said that they did not think a methods class would be "talking down" to them.

Bringing eleven people together for a full year in a town where they had few other friends and putting them through a program where they were together in classes several hours a day, sharing thoughts and problems and meeting the same academic requirements resulted in the development of close personal relationships. An esprit de corps soon developed and frequent group social events were planned to include field agent families. But during the year, the atmosphere broke down into one of occasional conflict and sustained competition among individuals and cliques within the group. A common phenomena with groups that have been isolated together over a long period of time seemed to be aggravated by the competition for grades in the social science classes which the field agents took. If programs like this aim to promote cooperation and sharing of ideas within social studies faculties in the target schools, the field agents themselves should have positive experiences in group planning during their training.

The original expectation that field agents would develop materials for a kit they could use the following year proved unrealistic. Once again the weaknesses in believing that each teacher can and should develop his own materials became evident. The field agents simply did not have the time or expertise to develop the best

possible instructional materials. For the most part they used their kit money to buy existing products that were created by professional developers.

Similarly, field agents did not have the expertise to develop the diagnostic instruments teachers in their schools would need or instructional programs for teacher education. Unfortunately there are very few professionally developed and tested in-service materials available for people like the field agents.

Another problem that had not been anticipated was that several of the field agents were not informed of their teaching assignments for the following year until just before the end of the training year in August. As a result they did not know what experimental set of materials to order and were not able to plan how they could use their own classrooms as a demonstration center for the innovations they hoped to diffuse among their colleagues.

III. THE FOLLOW-UP YEAR

Importance of Follow-up Year

Perhaps the most glaring weakness of many training programs is their lack of follow-up support for their participants. This inability to sustain a supporting relationship often stems from the fact that the training institution has no on-going commitment to planned diffusion activities. Such is not the case at Indiana University-Bloomington, as has already been pointed out. Through the Coordinator for School Social Studies, the National Diffusion Project, and the Social Studies Development Center, the University is in a position to support varied types of diffusion activities.

This ability and willingness to provide follow-up support to field agents is important in three ways. First, the field agent needs access to resources in addition to those available in his school. It is imperative that he be able to pick up a telephone and request a specific set of instructional materials, information about standardized tests, help in planning an in-service workshop, or request a visit by university personnel. This ability to tap outside resources enables the field agent to more rapidly respond to requests for his services and in so

doing enhances his local credibility. Second, follow-up support is concrete evidence to the field agent and those with whom he works that the University has a continuing commitment to his work. This evidence of continued support was very important to establishing the credibility of the eleven field agents in this program. They reported that, with the exception of student teacher supervisors, most school people seldom see any evidence that the faculty at the universities know or care what goes on in their school. Merely to have his colleagues know that someone from Bloomington had taken the time to stop by and see the field agent made his role something special.

Finally, developers are sometimes criticized for not being atuned to the wishes of adopters, a charge especially leveled at advocates of the Research, Development, Diffusion, and Adoption model of change. Continuing contacts between the field agents and the university support mechanism provides an avenue for this feedback. Follow-up activities provide a steady flow of data about the teacher's problems, feelings, and needs. Frequent contacts between university based developers and diffusers are a built-in protection against "ivory towerism."

One is tempted to maintain that the operation of a follow-up support system for field agents is the single most

powerful factor which contributes to their success. Caution and experience leads one to qualify such an unequivocal statement, but it still underscores the importance to the field agent of an active link to a supporting organization. In time a need may arise for an additional middle-man role, a field agent's field agent, such as Rogers has described in the field of agriculture.* That need will not arise until there are many more field agents.

The overall goal of the Social Studies Field Agent Program was to promote an awareness of, an interest in, and the trial and adoption of innovative social studies materials and procedures. More specifically the follow-up year objectives were:

1. Information about new social studies products and practices will be disseminated to social studies teachers and administrators in field agent areas more rapidly than would have been the case were it not for the field agents.

2. Field agents will build conviction about the "new social studies" among those persons with whom they come in contact.

3. Field agents will, in their own classrooms and in demonstration lessons, serve as examples of inquiry-type teachers.

---

* Everett M. Rogers. DEVELOPING A STRATEGY FOR PLANNED CHANGE. Paper presented at the Symposium on the Application of System Analysis and Management Techniques to Educational Planning in California, Orange, California. June, 1967. Mimeo.

4. Teachers and administrators will contact the field agents and ask them to visit their schools, speak to departmental meetings, teach demonstration lessons, display materials.

5. Field agents will speak to organizations such as the PTA, informing them of reforms currently taking place in social studies.

6. Field agents will convince some of their colleagues to try some of the new social studies curriculum materials and will assist in planning simplified field evaluations of such trials.

7. Field agents will provide the appropriate persons at Indiana University with information about the needs and desires of schools in their areas regarding new materials, consultant help, in-service training, and the skills and knowledge required of new teachers.

8. Field agents will execute the problem-oriented programs which they develop during the training year.

9. Field agents will secure the services of resource people needed to meet the needs of area teachers and school systems.

10. Field agents will gain the reputation in their area as "the person to see about what is going on in social studies."

11. Field agents will be assigned to committees and be given other responsibilities which carry curriculum decision-making power in their schools or districts.

12. Field agents will actively seek new contacts with social studies teachers and organizations in their areas.

13. Field agents will assist teachers in their area to become more critical consumers of new social studies products.

14. Field agents will assist schools in their areas in adapting new social studies products and practices to local needs.

15. Field agents will demonstrate their desire to

keep informed of changes in social studies by joining local, regional, state, and national social studies organizations.

16. Field agents will conduct themselves in such a manner as to effect change without unnecessarily antagonizing those around them.

17. Administrators in the field agents' schools will provide explicit support for the field agents and their activities.

18. Field agents will be provided additional support during the 1972-73 school year by their school systems.

These objectives form the basis for the evaluation procedures and data discussed later in this report.

Near the conclusion of their training, as the field agents prepared to return to their schools, they developed lists of specific services which they felt ready to provide. For example, one field agent developed the following announcement which he distributed to the social studies teachers and administrators in his school system.

> In the fall of 1971, secondary school social studies teachers will have new services available to them through the Social Studies Field Agent. I am currently consulting with teachers and administrators to identify areas that need attention and to determine priorities. Next year I will be teaching halftime at the High School with the rest of the day devoted to Field Agent work. As Field Agent I will be available to work with interested individual teachers and groups of teachers who wish assistance in improving their teaching skills and strategies. I will also be working in cooperation with teachers to generally facilitate constructive change in secondary school social studies and to utilize local and outside resources more effectively. Your questions, interests, and needs will be the determining factors in shaping the role of the Social Studies Field Agent for the Schools.

Another field agent listed the following possible functions in an early report he made to his school board and superintendent.

1. Disseminate general information of new materials, ideas, and teaching techniques available in the field to all social studies teachers.

2. Find and channel relevant information to teachers of particular subjects (e.g., curriculum materials available, community resources in economic education).

3. Aid teachers who wish assistance to find more effective means of teaching their subject matter (e.g., the Bill of Rights, inflation, prejudice, the Industrial Revolution).

4. Search for solutions to the felt needs of teachers.

5. Assist teachers in developing ideas they have.

6. Facilitate course development by taking care of some of the bureaucratic details of obtaining new materials or helping to determine the feasibility of a new procedure.

7. Evaluate available curriculum materials and teaching practices for teachers and/or assist them in this evaluation.

8. Demonstrate new materials and methods for teachers (in their classroom or mine).

9. Assist teachers in trying out new ideas for the first time in their own classrooms (e.g. simulations, inquiry).

10. Assist teachers in obtaining experimental materials to use and evaluate (this would include both published materials and those still being developed in curriculum projects).

11. Serve as a link between teachers and available university educational resources.

12. Assist teachers in improving their general teaching skills when and if desired (e.g., question asking, concept development).

13. Assist new teachers in their first months of teaching in areas they feel they would like some help.

14. Facilitate communication of ideas and activities between social studies teachers.

15. Help devise and implement methods of evaluating the effectiveness of an innovation in a particular setting.

16. Help modify innovations as necessary to meet the needs of a particular situation.

17. Nurturing innovations after they have been adopted by maintaining the physical and psychological conditions necessary for their successful continuation.

18. Raise the level of awareness of my colleagues and others in the community through activities such as departmental and in-service meetings, talks to PTA's and service clubs.

19. Serve as a consultant to other school systems in the area (perhaps by "trading" for the services of someone from the other school system).

20. Help organize a K-12 committee to facilitate evaluation and testing of new materials, to improve coordination between grade levels and schools, and to more systematically develop the total social studies curriculum.

Others of the field agents used less formal channels for describing the services which they were prepared to render, but all found some way to cope with the necessity to inform others of their new role.

Refresher/Diagnosis Workshops

The field agents returned to the Bloomington campus three times during the follow-up year for two-day workshops. These meetings were designed to serve a dual purpose:

first, to assist the field agents in keeping abreast of developments in social studies; and second, to provide a structured opportunity for them to share their problems with the group in the hope that solutions to them might be found. The sessions served a third, unanticipated function, i.e., to reinforce the role image of the participants through the process of their publicly describing their work.

The first refresher/diagnosis workshop was held in Bloomington on October 8-9, 1971. The program was as follows:

FRIDAY	
10:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Tom Collins, Director of School Programs, Center for War-Peace Studies Topic: "Ways the Field Agents and CWPS Can Be of Mutual Assistance."
11:00 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.	Reports from Field Agents (10-15 minutes each)
12:30 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	Finish Field Agent Reports
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.	Identify common problems and discuss possible solutions
5:00 p.m. - 7:30 p.m.	Dinner Break
9:30 p.m.	Informal get-together
SATURDAY	
9:00 a.m. - 10:45 a.m.	Plan November meeting in Denver

10:45 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Break
11:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	Bob Pireson, "Evening TV Considered as Another Educational Resource."

The presentations by Tom Collins and Bob Pireson introduced the field agents to two additional types of resources. Three and one-half hours were devoted to brief reports by each field agent about his activities during the first few weeks in his new role. While these reports were quite helpful to the university support staff, the field agents indicated later that they felt it was not efficient for them to sit through the descriptive reports of the ten other persons. Later workshops were altered accordingly.

The field agent reports surfaced two early problems: overload and role confusion. All of the field agents had returned to their schools fearful that no one would request their services. The opposite proved to be the case. Faced with near normal teaching loads, the felt need to get out into other schools in their area and many requests (some of them trivial) for their services, the field agents were confronted with the difficult task of setting priorities. The field agents felt that they should be models of inquiry teachers and their daily preparations for that role took even more time than they

had anticipated. This too added to the overload problem. Louis and Sieber later reported that a similar problem was encountered by the education information consultants sponsored by the United States Office of Education.* Havelock had also predicted the overload problem, both in personal conversations with the Co-directors and in earlier articles.** While the dilemma was a happy one for the field agents who had feared that they would be ignored, it was no less a problem for them.

Despite their many advance efforts to inform their colleagues about what a field agent was and what he could do, many of the field agents reported that they were seen as errand boys, supervisors who were there to evaluate their colleagues, representatives from the downtown office, etc. By the close of the first year these misconceptions had been corrected, but initially they proved very frustrating for the field agents.

The first workshop also dealt with the formal and informal contact report forms which all field agents had

---

* Karen Seashores Louis and Sam D. Sieber. FIELD AGENT ROLES IN EDUCATION, PART I. Materials from the USOE Pilot State Dissemination Program, Bureau of Applied Social Research, New York, January, 1972. Mimeo.

** Ronald G. Havelock, "Dissemination and Translation Roles," KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION. Terry L. Eidell and Joanne M. Kitchel, eds. Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene. 1968. pp. 64-120

been asked to file (see Appendix items K and L). Carole Hahn and James Dick, doctoral associates, gave the results of a tally of the reports filed between September 1 and October 1, the period just preceding the workshop (see Appendix items N and O).

Even at this early date it was apparent that this system of reporting field agent activities was not going to function as anticipated. Though one of the forms was redesigned in a check-off format (see Appendix item M) to reduce filing time, the field agents generally got further and further behind in their reporting. By the close of the school year in June about one-half were no longer bothering to file the reports and, with one or two exceptions, those who were generally did so with little enthusiasm. It was understandable that busy field agents should grow weary of a task that was so time consuming and the results of which primarily benefited the university support staff, though it does seem important to find some means of collecting such data.

The second refresher/diagnosis workshop was held in Bloomington on February 18-19, 1972. More than either of the other two workshops, this one focused on informing the field agents about various new social

studies programs and development efforts. The program was as follows:

FRIDAY	
9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.	Coffee and conversation with Harry Stein, Director of School Services, the African-American Institute.
10:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.	Announcements and housekeeping details.
10:15 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	Briefing by Jim Becker on the activities of the National Diffusion Project; by John Patrick on the World History Project
12:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.	Demonstration of the ACTION MAP. Program by Dick Segall
2:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.	Report by Bob Hanvey on the Current Status of the Anthropology Case Materials Project
3:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.	Coffee and Coke Break
3:15 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.	Demonstration of WARD 23 Data Bank with field agents as students.
5:00 p.m.	Adjournment
Evening	Informal get-together
SATURDAY	
9:30 a.m. - 10:45 a.m.	Some Do's and Don'ts of Proposal Writing by Howard Mehlinger
10:45 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	Mutual assistance with our "Common and Most Pressing Problems"
12:00 p.m.	Adjournment

The third and final workshop was held in Bloomington on May 5-6, 1972, and was devoted almost exclusively to debriefing the field agents concerning their year's activities.

NCSS Denver Convention

In addition to the three two-day refresher/diagnosis workshops, the field agents also met in Denver at the Annual Convention of the National Council for the Social Studies. In all but one case, the field agents' schools paid the expenses associated with this trip, a provision of the letter of agreement which each school system had signed.

The field agents were free to attend any of the many activities of the convention. Some of them assumed the role of presenter when they conducted a session on how to use games in teaching social studies. One day was set aside for activities organized by the Co-directors. During that morning the field agents had informal discussions with Fred Newmann, a major developer of the Public Issues Series, published by American Education Publications, and John Neal, chief social studies editor for Ginn Company, publishers of American Political Behavior. Both gentlemen were interested in the problems and techniques the field agents were using to diffuse their respective materials, and the field agents had an

opportunity to learn about diffusion from the publishers' and authors' points-of-view.

In the afternoon the field agents and the Co-directors traveled to Boulder where they visited the Human Sciences for the Middle School, a project of the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study Program. James Eckenrod, a member of the HSMS development team, explained to the field agents how a major development project goes about creating and testing a course which combines science and social science. Some of the field agents indicated a willingness to try to arrange for trials of the new program in their schools. The final stop of the afternoon was at the Social Science Education Consortium and the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Science/Social Studies. There the field agents heard explanations of the services of those two organizations and had an opportunity to browse in the SSEC's extensive curriculum library.

Both the convention and the day of special activities again served to keep the field agents in touch with developments in social studies. It also again identified them, both to themselves and others, as a special group playing a somewhat unique role. In retrospect, these frequent reinforcements of their role images evidently were important in sustaining their conception of what it

meant to be field agents.

School Visits

A major activity (in terms of time and expense) during the follow-up year was visits to each of the field agent's schools. Each field agent was visited once, some as many as three times. On some visits the Co-directors or other university support staff had direct responsibility for in-service programs or presentations at departmental meetings. At other times the visits were very informal with someone merely following in the field agent's steps for that day. Almost all visits included talks with the principal of the field agent's school, and sometimes the superintendent made time in his schedule to see the person from Bloomington. The visits appear to have been important for a number of reasons, but perhaps the most important was that they were tangible evidence that the university maintained a continuing interest in the field agent and his school. Field agents often commented that such "showing of the flag" was important reinforcement to their field agent images, especially those held by their colleagues.

When someone from Bloomington participated in a meeting, a specific attempt was made to insure that the field agent's colleagues understood that the visitor was there to help the field agent, not to run things or tell him

what to do. It was always the field agent's show.

In addition to the regular visits by the support staff, Carole Hahn conducted workshops for teachers in some of the field agents' schools. She was employed during the second semester of the 1971-72 school year by the Indiana University Social Studies Development Center (with funds provided by the Ginn Company) to conduct awareness workshops about the newly developed civics course, American Political Behavior. Since she was the primary presenter in such activities, they were the one exception to the helping role stance taken in all other school visits.

Telephone Consultations

During the follow-up year field agents often called Bloomington to request assistance with all types of problems, and sometimes just to talk. Perhaps the most typical call was to request help in locating a particular type of material to meet a specific client need. Sometimes the calls were the beginning plans of an in-service meeting or to discuss the details of a visit by someone from Bloomington. A few times during the year, field agents asked for help in convincing administrators of the merits of an idea and occasionally to persuade an administrator that what a field agent had been asked to do was unwise and/or impossible, e. g.,

to develop a K-12 curriculum guide in a few weeks.

Newsletter and Cassettes

If the field agents are to keep themselves current in the field of social studies, they obviously have to read many newsletters and journals dealing with that area of the curriculum. Such "keeping-up" activities require initiative and often some cash outlay, but supposedly this willingness to keep one's self current is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the field agents. Fortunately, the Coordinator for School Social Studies at Indiana University already published News and Notes on the Social Sciences, a newsletter issued three times each school year free of charge to interested persons. During their internships, some of the field agents wrote News and Notes copy and all became well acquainted with the publication. Field agents continued to receive News and Notes during the follow-up year and will continue to receive it as long as they wish. News and Notes was not initiated for the field agents, nor is it devoted only to items of interest to them. The newsletter does, however, represent still another type of service which can support local change agents by tying them into a larger information net.

Unlike News and Notes, cassette tapes were made spe-

cifically for use by the field agents. Three times during the follow-up year tapes were prepared, multiple copies made, and a copy sent to each field agent. Like the refresher/diagnosis workshops, these taped messages had two primary objectives. First, they were still another means of informing field agents about new materials, projects, and trends in social studies. Whenever possible prices, addresses of publishers, phone numbers to call, and other specific information was included. Though all the field agents received many more publication notices, brochures about training institutes, and other promotional mail than they had prior to the training program, most of them reported that the tapes usually carried information about materials or activities which had not, for one reason or another, crossed their desks. Put another way, information contained on the tapes was usually not redundant, and in the evaluation several field agents suggested that even greater use be made of this mode of information transmittal.

The cassettes had a second, and equally important, objective. As mentioned earlier in regard to the school visits, the field agents indicated that it was important to them to feel that they still had strong ties to the support staff in Bloomington. Toward that end, the tapes often contained newsy items, congratulations

to specific field agents for a job well done or a publication or program that had gone well. At times the message bordered on a soft-sell pep talk. Again, the field agents were never talked down to but were always treated as colleagues.

Consultants

Each field agent had $300.00 which he could use to employ consultants. One field agent arranged for a visit by a professor from a nearby university. The professor visited classes, talked with teachers, and wrote a brief evaluation of what he had observed. Another field agent employed James Dick, one of the doctoral associates, to assist him in writing a set of curriculum recommendations for his school system. Still another field agent arranged for a university team to conduct a one day in-service program for the teachers in his school. Most field agents chose not to use their consultant funds. The most common explanation for this was simply that they felt no need for such additional help.

Diffusing the Field Agent Program

In addition to providing follow-up support to the field agents, the Bloomington staff engaged in activities designed to inform others about the program. Both of the Co-directors made speeches about the program at the

National Council for the Social Studies Convention in November. During the winter a 22-minute slide tape about the program was developed and later used to present the program at the Annual Convention of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Later some of the field agents used the slide tape in presentations to their school boards. A professional journalist was employed to prepare a news release briefly describing the program.

A written description of the training portion of the program appeared in the May, 1972 issue of Viewpoints, i.e., Alice Jwaideh and Gerald W. Marker, "Training Teachers as Change Agents: The Social Studies Field Agent Training Program," pp. 111-137. Viewpoints is published by the School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

A description of the program will also be included in a longer work on the topic of change in social studies also by Jwaideh and Marker. That change booklet will be published by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Social Studies/ Social Science at Boulder, Colorado.

During the 1972-73 academic year, the Co-directors and doctoral associates will continue to write and speak

about the field agent program. For example, the second in a three year sequence of Action Labs on Change is already scheduled for the ASCD Annual Convention to be held in the spring of 1973.

Summary

The real test of any diffusion program occurs in the field when the change agents begin to work with their clients. Yet it is at exactly this point, i.e., when the change agents conclude the training program and return to the field, that most programs end. For the new change agents it is "sink or swim," hardly a defensible training procedure for those who advocate planned change. The Social Studies Field Agent Training Program was designed not to leave the field agent on his own at the very time he most needed support. The preceding discussion of follow-up year support activities describes what types of assistance were provided by the Bloomington-based staff. Essentially the same support will be available to the field agents during the 1972-73 academic year made possible by carry-over monies remaining in the U.S.O.E. and Ford Foundation accounts as well as the funds of the office of the Coordinator for School Social Studies. It is important to note that the Coordinator's activities represent a long-standing commitment on the part of Indiana University-Bloomington,

having been initiated in 1959. Even when U.S.O.E. and Ford monies are exhausted (June 30, 1973), the Coordinators Office will continue in its support role.

IV. EVALUATION

Introduction

Because of the rather unusual nature of this program, it seemed important that a careful evaluation of its impact be done by a disinterested third party. Arrangements were made with Services for Educational Evaluation, Inc. to conduct the evaluation. This group of evaluators, while based at Indiana University, was in no way connected to the program and had no vested interest in seeing it succeed. It appeared to the program Co-directors that such an evaluation group would be most likely to produce an objective assessment of the program's success, or lack of it.

There were two major areas of focus for the evaluation effort. One area included was the program objectives, training program, and follow-up activities. The second was the activity of the field agents during their first year back in the schools. In this regard an attempt was made to find out to what extent the program met the eighteen follow-up year objectives. Specific data collection procedures are described in connection with each of the evaluation areas.

Field Agent Ratings of Program Objectives

Earlier in this report the program's objectives, as formulated by the Co-directors, were presented. It is well to remember that these objectives were formulated prior to the beginning of the training year. After a year of field experience (spring, 1972), the field agents were asked to rank and comment on the program objectives (see Appendix item G). Their reactions to the types of activities called for in the objectives should prove useful to others who are contemplating training and supporting persons in such roles.

Field agents ranked the objectives in the following order (by mean scores):*

1. Information about new social studies products and practices will be disseminated to social studies teachers and administrators in field agent areas more rapidly than would have been the case were it not for the field agents.
   Mean 1.1 Rating 1 2 3 4 5
   Frequency 8 1

2. Field agents will, in their own classrooms and in demonstration lessons, serve as examples of inquiry-type teachers.
   Mean 1.1 1 2 3 4 5
   7 1

3. Field agents will gain the reputation in their areas as "the person to see about what is going on in social studies."
   Mean 1.2 1 2 3 4 5
   7 2

* One is the highest rating, five the lowest.

4. Field agents will demonstrate their desire to keep informed of changes in social studies by joining local, regional, state, and national social studies organizations.

Mean 1.2

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	8				1

5. Field agents will build conviction about the "new social studies" among those persons with whom they come in contact.

Mean 1.3

1	2	3	4	5
6		3		

6. Field agents will be assigned to committees and be given other responsibilities which carry curriculum decision-making power in their schools or districts.

Mean 1.4

1	2	3	4	5
6	2	1		

7. Field agents will actively seek new contacts with social studies teachers and organizations in their areas.

Mean 1.4

1	2	3	4	5
6	2	1		

8. Field agents will assist teachers in their areas to become more critical consumers of new social studies products.

Mean 1.4

1	2	3	4	5
5	4			

9. Field agents will assist schools in their areas in adopting new social studies products and practices to local needs.

Mean 1.4

1	2	3	4	5
6	2	1		

10. Field agents will convince some of their colleagues to try some of the new social studies curriculum materials and will assist in planning simplified field evaluations of such trials.

Mean 1.6

1	2	3	4	5
5	3	1		

11. Administrators in the field agents' schools will provide explicit support for the field agents and their activities.

Mean 1.6

1	2	3	4	5
6	1	2		

12. Field agents will conduct themselves in such a manner as to effect change without unnecessarily antagonizing those around them.

Mean	1.7	Rating	1	2	3	4	5
		Frequency	5	2	2		

13. Teachers and administrators will contact the field agents and ask them to visit their schools, speak to departmental meetings, teach demonstration lessons, display materials.

Mean	1.8	1	2	3	4	5
		3	5	1		

14. Field agents will be provided additional support during the 1972-73 school year by their school systems.

Mean	1.9	1	2	3	4	5
		5	1	2	1	

15. Field agents will secure the services of resource people needed to meet the needs of area teachers and school systems.

Mean	2.0	1	2	3	4	5
		3	4	1	1	

16. Field agents will provide the appropriate persons at Indiana University with information about the needs and desires of schools in their areas regarding new materials, consultant help, in-service training, and the skills and knowledge required of new teachers.

Mean	2.1	1	2	3	4	5
		2	4	3		

17. Field agents will execute the problem-oriented programs which they develop during the training year.

Mean	2.7	1	2	3	4	5
		1	3	2	3	

18. Field agents will speak to organizations such as the PTA informing them of reforms currently taking place in social studies.

Mean	3.4	1	2	3	4	5
				6	2	1

The preceding ranking of objectives supports the contention that the field agents had adopted the broad diffusion goals of the general program. The first ten objectives are much more directly related

to the diffusion of innovations than is the last group of eight. This commitment to diffusion also surfaced repeatedly in the problem-oriented discussions which took place during the three refresher/diagnosis workshops. A typical comment was: "I will be a field agent next year whether they support me or not. I just can't help but be after this year."

What the Co-directors thought would be an important area of activity turned out not to be. Prior to the training program it seemed logical that the field agents would be asked to speak to community groups such as parent teacher organizations and civic clubs. That turned out not to be the case. Such invitations were not forthcoming and most of the field agents indicated that they would feel uncomfortable fulfilling them should they come.

While support was available for each field agent to employ outside resource persons, only four of the eleven used such help. These resource persons were in addition to the support services provided by the Bloomington staff. While there were various reasons given for not making use of outside persons, the major one was a feeling on the part of the field agents that they could do the job as well themselves. Other field agents

reported that their schools had had some bad experiences with previous in-service programs conducted by outsiders, and they preferred to avoid being the sponsor of another program which really "turned off" their colleagues.

In summary, the field agents' ranking of the program objectives may not prove very useful to others who plan such programs simply because they may only reflect a preference for certain objectives due to the fact that those objectives were also considered most important by the program staff. The major exception to this was the fact that the program Co-directors considered objective 14 (as ranked by the field agents) as a primary objective for the second year of field work.

In response to the final item on the Objective Rating Sheet which asked about the selection procedures used for the program, the field agents offered the following comments:

> I believe that women should have been represented in the program--recruited if necessary. The interview, the letter of recommendation, and past record of achievement was a fair and systematic manner of selecting trainees.
>
> I believe the F.A. candidate should have made at least verbal agreement and commitment to stay in the public schools for a minimum of two to three years.
>
> In order for long term benefits to be generated, people who are selected should be committed to working in a particular system for several years. The selected people also should not be very interested in moving into full time administrative positions. The experiences of the F.A. program promote mobility in the profession.

My knowledge on the procedures is limited, however, the specifics of the follow-up year should be more clearly enumerated in the agreement.

The school system as well as persons should be evaluated at the time of selection. Without a firm commitment for support, the Field Agent will have nothing but trouble.

It was satisfactory.

I feel that consideration might be given to choosing those applicants who are in power positions or have definite support from those who hold such positions.

I have no suggestions here because I am not sure just what procedures were used. The group of which I was one seems to me, upon reflection, to have been excellently composed--i.e., varying ages; backgrounds (personally and academically); schools (geographical area, size, urban, rural, etc.). Innovation should know no boundaries.

Field Agent Evaluation of the Training Program

As a part of the evaluation, field agents were asked to rate specific aspects of the training program. This survey was conducted in April, 1972, about eight months after the conclusion of the training program which enabled the field agents to view the experience from the perspective of a year of experience (see Item G in the Appendix for a copy of the questionnaire). The various components of the training program were described earlier in this report, thus descriptions are not repeated in this section. Rather, each question is shown with the field agents' responses in terms of frequency and means. These are followed by comments about each component of the program as they were made

by the field agents. Finally, a summary of the program concludes this section on program evaluation.

1. Twenty-four hours of social science and history.
   Mean 3.2*

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency			7	2	

   -Varied greatly with course--high ratings to Thompson's course and Olson's course.
   -I feel it is imperative that a F.A. type be well grounded in subject content before being able to discuss materials and ideas. Many of the courses taken were too narrow to be of much value.
   -In terms of strictly F.A. activities it was not very useful.
   -Twelve hours of Political Science not really useful to the program although it did fit my major (history and political science).
   -Provided general knowledge most of which was inapplicable to the field agent role.
   -While the course work was fruitful, it served very little in the way of assisting the field agent.

2. S519: Seminar on Teaching Social Studies
   Mean 1.0

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	10				

   -Placed everyone on common ground, frame of reference.
   -This was the most helpful aspect of the program. This seminar should have continued for the entire year.
   -We began getting socialized here and thinking in terms of the new social studies and our roles as diffusers. Also examining curriculum materials was very important.
   -The program needed at least another session of this sort.
   -Very practical.
   -Best course in many ways. It provided good information and techniques.

3. R590: Seminar on the Sociological Aspects of Diffusion
   Mean 3.3

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency		2	4	3	1

   -Content was certainly relevant but the teaching left something to be desired--more application of knowledge via role play, etc. would have been helpful.

---

*One is the highest rating, five the lowest.

-Too theoretical.
-Not very practical or relevant to anything which I've done this year--course would have been useful for those training us.
-The theoretical knowledge has not been useful. More time could have been spent on how to diffuse; operationalizing the various strategies would have been more important.
-This needed a bit more direction by the project directors.
-Should have worked on techniques and planning rather than being so heavy in content.
-Good information, problems in course were to a great degree our fault.

4. R590: Seminar on the Techniques of Diffusion

Mean 1.5	Rating	1	2	3	4	5
	Frequency	7	2		1	

-Much more practical than first.
-The thing that made this class more valuable was frequent assignments making us apply the knowledge (content) to activities field agent would likely engage in.
-This seminar was more practical and many of the sessions were of direct benefit with regard to problems I've encountered this year.
-I have found valuable in my own thinking but I implemented little of what we discussed together.
-This one had direction by the project directors.
-Occurred too late to really help in planning.
-Much better.

5. Internship in teacher education

Mean 2.8	Rating	1	2	3	4	5
	Frequency	3	1	1	3	1

-Time problem.
-I would have liked to have gotten more involved.
-The instructor did not give the intern any direction.
-It was a very valuable personal experience but not for F.A. purposes. I have not been in a teacher training role in a big way.
-Of little utility.

6. Internship in the coordinator's office

Mean 1.9	Rating	1	2	3	4	5
	Frequency	2	7	1		

-Good information.
-More involvement needed.
-Very useful.
-The trips to schools, analyzing materials, and the new social studies speech were helpful.
-More time and credit should have been made available. I suggest this as replacing R590 and internship with Social Studies Methods Class.

7. Internship in the Social Studies Development Center
Mean 3.6

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	2	2	4	2	

-My experience was mostly library research which I already know how to do.
-Personally I found this very rewarding, but much less so as field agent. I suggest eliminating this.
-I gained an appreciation of problems of development, particularly with games--simulations that have been helpful this year.
-Useful--but a regular schedule would have helped give more fruitful results.
-Could have been very good but we drew June, July, and August.
-Specialized instruction in games and simulation.

8. Colloquia (evenings at Carole's and Doug's)
Mean 1.7

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	4	5	1		

-Some were quite good, others served very little.
-Good.
-The information was generally useful particularly regarding materials.
-Credit should have been given and time designated--too much to ask of people who had no time to spend.
-Good chance to share ideas.

9. Demonstration lessons taught by field agents
Mean 1.7

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	4	5	1		

-Very useful.
-It made us act on knowledge.
-More of this.
-Need more time for follow-up improvement steps.
-Definitely more of this was needed.

10. CMAS exercise (Curriculum Materials Analysis Systems, done in S519 Fall seminar)
Mean 2.0

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	3	3	3		

-Due to time factors, I did not do much in this area--could have been very good.
-Good and I have used CMAS reports.
-It made me think about materials more carefully, but I have not used CMAS because of a lack of time.
-More time should have been devoted to this exercise.

11. Diagnostic evaluation (done in the S519 Fall seminar)
Mean 1.7

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	4	4	1		

-Made us take a long systematic look at our school.
-It made me think about my situation but I see no dramatic results.
-Interesting--could have been more useful with follow-up.
-Needed to spend more time in this area.

12. Diffusion plan (done in the summer seminar)
Mean 1.9 Rating 1 2 3 4 5
Frequency 4 1 3
-Have not been able to follow completely; a lot of work for one small phase.
-Should have been begun sooner.
-Should have done more than one.
-This hasn't functioned for me--initial direction of my thrust was wrong perhaps!
-It was useful to think a plan through but its usefulness was limited because it was over-planned. Most of the planning was not necessary because of little resistance.
-Very useful even though plan has had to be modified considerably.

13. Thirty-minute video taped speech on the new social studies
Mean 1.8 Rating 1 2 3 4 5
Frequency 3 2 2
-Useful even though I haven't had to give such a formal presentation yet--the critique of each speaker was also helpful.
-Not all of us had that assignment; I was one who didn't. I think it should be an assignment for all participants in future programs.
-It made me formulate my thoughts on the subject coherently.
-This was valuable practice.
-Didn't do it.

14. Attendance at the Indiana Council for the Social Studies Convention
Mean 2.7 Rating 1 2 3 4 5
Frequency 1 2 5 1
-Would have been good to attend during the training year also.
-Interesting but of little use to me other than the free materials I got.
-It was good to participate in a program.
-Should continue to be an integral aspect of the program.

15. Visits to schools with Tom Brown, Assistant

Social Studies Coordinator
Mean 2.0

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	3	3	1	1	

-Very difficult to find the time to attend these schools. Required to skip classes in order to fulfill that obligation. Visits should have been better planned with follow-up trip.
-It reduced my myopic view of schools to see different contexts.
-This is an eye-opener.
-More needed.

16. In-service meetings planned and conducted by field agents
Mean 1.8

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	5	2	1	1	

-Much more needed.
-Should have been done more frequently.
-Gave tremendous help for this year.
-I have done none of that this year.
-I did not participate in any of these.
-I gave them a high rating, but we spent too little time in the endeavor. We should have prepared in-service presentations to utilize this year as part of our seminar work.

17. Stacks of handouts
Mean 1.4

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	6	4			

-I have used these often.
-Some handouts have been very useful, others no value but generally a very excellent way of getting information.
-Many of them have become useful unexpectedly.
-These make useful files.
-Still use these for various requests, in-services.
-Generally very useful.

18. Spring conference for administrators
Mean 1.2

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	8	2			

-Good
-Useful to involve the administrators, but in some cases (or at least one) I don't think it took.
-The contract was good and generated enthusiasm back in * * *.
-We should have held additional conferences--one at the beginning and another at the end of the training.

19. Assembling kits
Mean 1.9

Rating	1	2	3	4	5
Frequency	4	3	3		

-It was important but I often felt lost as to how to do it.
-Very useful--additional money each year to add new items would be excellent.
-Need more time and advice.
-Who really has any idea of what will work and what won't work. I wish I had included some materials from all the projects on a large scale--large enough for classroom trial. Example: 2 episodes from SRSS; 2 or 3 simulations, etc.
-Needed more direction.
-More time and planning needed.
-I felt I could have better purchased some of the books, theory books less used by teachers.

As indicated from the preceding field agent reactions, certain aspects of the training program activities were much more productive than others. Certainly the 24 hours of work in the social sciences left something to be desired and apparently could be deleted from future training programs. This is not to say that it is unimportant for field agents to know their subject well, but it does seem to indicate that the typical university social science course is not highly relevant to persons being trained in the area of diffusion. This is an interesting (and somewhat disturbing) finding since one would think that social science would have much to offer a person interested in how change occurs. The few social science courses which were given high ratings generally were in some way related to teaching, e.g., "World History for Teachers."

Even the seminars thought to deal specifically with

diffusion were rated quite differently by the field agents; i.e., S519 (Seminar on Teaching Social Studies), mean of 1.0; S590 (Sociological Aspects of Diffusion), mean of 3.3; R590 (Techniques of Diffusion), mean of 1.5. Evidently it was the theoretical content of the middle seminar which made it seem less useful to the field agents than the other two seminars.

The ratings of the various internship experiences also had a wide range, from 1.9 to 3.6. Again it would seem that the more directly the internship was related to diffusion, the higher its rating.

The one clear message that comes through the comments about the training program is that more practice exercises are needed, and this is in spite of the fact that a real attempt was made to include a fair number of such experiences in the program. In many ways this is the same type of demand being made by students in teacher education programs. Perhaps as much as 40 or 50 percent of a field agent's training should consist of very practical applications where the principles of change are used in solving or at least in confronting the everyday problems faced by people in the field. When such activities were included they received high marks, e.g., demonstration lessons, diagnostic eval-

uations, diffusion plans, video taped speech.

Field Agent Self-Assessed Impact

In addition to items concerning the training year activities, the Field Agent Rating Sheet (see Appendix item G) also asked the field agents to evaluate the extent and nature of the impact which they had made on their clients. Admittedly the field agents were hardly neutral observers and may have tended to overestimate the impact of their efforts. Despite a justifiable prejudice, the field agents' assessment of their efforts, while usually slightly higher than those of their colleagues and administrators, were still close enough to be believable.

Question 1 in part two of the Field Agent Rating Sheet contained the following three items:

	FA Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5*	Means FA	Teach	Adm
1. Would you say you have noticed definite innovation in your department in the past year in methods and materials?	5	5				1.5	1.8	1.6
Would you say these changes were greater than in previous years?	5	4				1.4	1.7	1.5

*One is the highest rating, five the lowest.

	FA Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Means FA	Teach	Adm
Do you feel that you could attribute these changes (if there have been some) to your influence?	5	5				1.5	1.7	1.7

Field Agents' Comments:

-I think that more games are being used or considered for use and I think that our in-service on this is partially responsible.
-My Department Chairman worked closely with me and then I took over his job.
-There has definitely been more talk and action between department members concerning new Social Studies activities. Teachers have been more willing to share and to try new materials.
-There are many variables involved in change. The situation is one. Since the situation in * * * is ripe, I've been able to make some progress given a favorable situation.

From these results to question 1, one can infer that the field agents had a definite feeling of accomplishment about their work, an important factor if other field agents are to be recruited and if those already in the roles are to choose to remain there.

	FA Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Means FA	Teach	Adm
2. Do you feel that new social studies products and practices are more easily obtainable now than in the past?	7	2	1			1.4	1.7	2.0
Do you feel that this is a direct result of your efforts?	6	3				1.3	1.8	

Field Agents' Comments:

-Generally I found large numbers of teachers who want

to try new social studies curriculum once they become aware of them. Awareness has been my major task--most teachers just didn't know what was available.
-I don't know how or if this will continue if or when my effort ceases (not institutionalized).
-I feel this is a combination of the fact of market availability and my efforts. I recently visited a large school in southern Indiana and none of their teachers had heard of the New Project materials.
-I am not real sure. We certainly have more information on "new" social studies and maybe certain things are more obtainable.

When teachers and administrators were asked about the availability of materials, it was the teachers who most felt the results of the field agents' efforts in this area. Certainly given the one-to-one type of contacts that most field agents reported, it was easier to impress one's colleagues about the availability of materials than the administrator who was one step removed from the scene.

		FA Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Means FA	Teach	Adm
3.	Do you feel that more teachers have become aware of the "new social studies?"	6	3				1.3	1.7	
	Do you feel that these teachers feel "committed" to the innovations?	2	2	6			2.4	2.1	

Field Agents' Comments:

-Some are willing to try these "new" things but ("committed" to innovation) is too strong a phrase to describe them.
-Many teachers have frequently made a commitment to the new social studies who had not previously done so. Others have made a commitment not to accept the new social studies.

-This must be answered on an individual basis, some have, most have not.
-Again as a general statement.

		FA Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Means FA	Teach	Adm
4.	Do you feel that more teachers have become aware of what it means to be an inquiry-type teacher (such as from a demonstration lesson)?	4	4	1	1		1.9	1.8	

Field Agents' Comments:

-Lesson at in-service helped here. And I see more lessons of inquiry-type going into different classes.
-Many (8) teachers are much more aware than they were in the past.
-I believe this is a slow process--one in which teachers move gradually along a continuum from very traditional noninquiry to innovative inquiry teaching.
-To the extent that it has happened it has come through using inquiry oriented materials.

		FA Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Means FA	Teach	Adm
5.	Have teachers decided to try any new social studies curriculum materials?	9	1				1.1	1.4	
	Were you able to assist them in conducting simple evaluations of such try-outs?	4	3	1			2.0	2.1	
	Do you feel that their reactions were generally favorable?	5	4	1			1.6	1.7	

Field Agents' Comments:

-I believe this area is my greatest success--many teachers are using new materials exclusively in their classes. Evaluations have been very simplistic but teachers are beginning to think about evaluation and discussing it with myself and others.
-Need for more material which is a system problem.

-I have made available certain items. Not yet. Generally speaking the reaction has been "well, maybe it's worth trying."
-On second thought--evaluation was based on less than total, well-planned objective tests.

Again, in questions 4 and 5 one finds close agreement between the ratings of the field agents and their colleagues. Since one of the primary objectives for the program was to move social studies innovations to the trial stage of diffusion, the means of 1.1 and 1.4 for the first part of question 5 are significant. It should again be stated that for trial to result in a decision not to adopt does not necessarily mean that diffusion was unsuccessful. It could be that the trial proved that the materials or procedures were not suited for the particular students or teachers of a given school. A "no adopt" decision on the basis of a local trial is quite different, and from this program's point of view, better than not to adopt because of a lack of awareness.

	FA Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Means FA	Teach	Adm
6. Do you feel that your public relations in attempting to implement change have been positive?	5	3	1			1.6	1.7	1.6

Field Agents' Comments:

-The results are mixed and must be evaluated individually.
-In most cases, but there are some instances where I'm seen in a very negative way.
-Comments to field agent have been very positive, but limited to too few cases.

-No strong push. Just, here are some "new" things that might help.
-I've had favorable reception with higher administration, the school foundation and from students. No response, negative or positive from the "public."

Public relations was certainly more of a problem for some field agents than for others. The field agents' personalities were an important variable in this regard. Some of the eleven field agents were naturals with the soft-sell, while others found it an uncomfortable style and related to their colleagues in quite different ways. Even though most of the field agents complained from time to time (and in their questionnaire comments) about the lack of feedback regarding their public relations, their ratings were very consistent with those of their colleagues and administrators.

	FA Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Means FA	Teach	Adm
7. Would you say that you have received support for your activities from the administrators in your school system?	5	2	3			1.8	1.6	1.4

Field Agents' Comments:

-Money has been tight; from department chairman on up everyone has been most supportive of my suggestions, etc.
-Verbally and money for trips to convention; basic problems are because of the social studies supervisor.
-On certain types of activities- yes, on other types- no; i.e., (1) In-service, yes (they got something cheap). (2) On buying materials, no (they plead costs are too high).
-Support outwardly has been good, but on critical issues (purchasing materials, etc.) they have been less willing to support.

-Qualification: the superintendent for instruction is one who allows change but doesn't work for it.

		FA Frequencies					Means		
		1	2	3	4	5	FA	Teach	Adm
8.	Do you feel that your chances of receiving support during the next school year are good?	2	4	1		1	2.3	1.7	1.7

Field Agents' Comments:

-Not applicable as I'm a coordinator and this is already an institutionalized role.
-Since I received almost none this year, the system is making little sacrifice. All indications are that they will.
-I would feel lucky if I got half my expenses to NCSS.
-I have no idea.
-Money is very tight and teachers will have increased loads but support for attending the National Convention, State Convention, and refresher/diagnosis workshops are fair.

In terms of both questions 7 and 8 the field agents were more pessimistic than the teachers or administrators. Field agents were probably in a better position to judge the amount of support than either of the other groups. Not all schools kept the pledges they made in their letter of agreement (see Appendix item B) with the most common failure being in the area of providing travel money for the field agent. Perhaps this is understandable since two of the field agents' schools were closed during the year, one because of lack of funds and the other from a strike resulting from a drastically cut budget. In neither situation were the school administrators, signers of the letter of agreement, in control of the situation. As mentioned in the section dealing with the teacher and

administrator questionnaires, only time will tell how accurate are the predictions of question 8.

	FA Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Means FA	Teach	Adm
9. Would you say the social studies department in your school has made progress away from traditional (i.e., textbook-centered) methods in the past year?	7	3				1.3	1.9	1.8

The field agent questionnaire ended with a question about the degree to which social studies was moving away from the traditional, textbook-centered courses so typical of that subject across the nation. Here field agents were more optimistic than teachers or administrators. It is difficult to know who has the more accurate perception in this regard. Perhaps the field agents were looking at the world as they wished it to be, but one could also argue that they were in the best position to really see what changes had occurred. The field agents knew of every case where change had taken place, yet this would not have been true of most administrators and many teachers. Field agents' comments also seem to reflect a general optimism:

> -Yes, we have made definite progress this year. I feel we have some distance yet to travel.
> -Basically my department is now aware and attempting to change traditional approaches to teaching.
> -Although the traditional text is here we are using more games, A-V materials, short lessons, etc. (sometimes the things we use aren't, in my opinion, good inquiry; but it is a step away from traditional text domination of the social studies courses).

-Again, certain individuals have, but not all--some in power positions.
-At the secondary level, with the exception of one school.
-For some yes, for others no.

Teacher and Administrator Questionnaires and Telephone Interviews

At the February refresher/diagnosis workshop each field agent was asked to list at least three administrators and six or more teachers or others who could provide information or their reaction to the field agent program. Each person listed was sent either an administrator or teacher questionnaire on which they were to respond to various aspects of the training and implementation program of the field agent project. Most questions asked respondents to indicate their evaluation on a scale from one to five. A total of 84 teacher questionnaires were mailed with 55 being returned and of the 40 administrators surveyed, 34 responded. As a validity check a random sample was drawn from the list of teachers named by the field agents. A total of sixteen teachers were interviewed by telephone--at least one, sometimes two, from each school. (See Appendix items H and I for samples of the teacher and administrator questionnaires.)

The following discussion is organized around the actual questions used in the teacher and administrator questionnaires. Preceding the discussion, the question or questions are stated along with a frequency count and mean for the two survey populations. Because the teacher instrument was considerably longer than that for the administrators, the latter are not represented in regard to specific questions. In addition, the evaluators' summary of the telephone interviews is also quoted.

The first four questions on the teacher questionnaire and the first two on the administrator questionnaire dealt with the general status of the social studies program in the field agents' schools.

A. IN GENERAL:		Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
1. Would you say the social studies department in your school has made progress away from traditional (i.e., textbook-centered) methods in the past year?	T	19	27	7	1	1	1.9
	A	16	12	3	2	1	1.8
2. Would you say you have made more use of new materials and methods in teaching in the past year than in previous years?	T	30	14	5	4	2	1.8
3. Would you say that this school system gives "rewards" for innovating?	T	5	13	17	8	10	3.1
	A	6	10	12	2	3	2.6

4. How would you rate changes in the social studies curriculum?

CHECK APPROPRIATE PHRASES	Teacher Responses
a. give teacher opportunity to try new things	52
b. often disregard proven teaching methods	1
c. too slow in coming about	20
d. overwhelm the teacher with irrelevant and difficult materials	2
e. too often emphasize change for change's sake alone	10
f. are attempting to institute radical rather than gradual innovation	5

Answers to the first four questions in the questionnaires would seem to indicate that teachers and administrators feel that change is taking place; that their social studies programs are moving away from the traditional textbook-centered courses still so typical in schools today. During the training year the field agents often reported that there was a general lack of rewards for innovative teachers, and the data would seem to bear this out. The means of 3.1 and 2.6 are the lowest of the four, and that question generated teacher respondent comments typified by the following:

-I consider rewards as being time to develop a new program--everything must be done on your own time.
-Not other than kind words from the administration from time to time.
-They are pleased as long as there is not much financial stake involved.

Administrator comments to question 3 also confirm the general lack of rewards, e.g.:

> -Central administration, "yes;" community, "no;" too many ultraconservatives hear.
> -Encouragement and compliments, no other forms of rewards.
> -The rewards that we do give are embarrassingly minimal.
> -I don't understand "rewards." Teachers are given additional time and lots of encouragement to "try" their ideas.
> -Sometimes, but somewhat unpredictably. Intrinsic rewards may be perceived as students/teachers reacting favorably. Extrinsic rewards are few.
> -This depends on the meaning of "rewards." If you mean money, no; if you mean praise and recognition of the program, yes.
> -Primarily through promotions, department chairmanships, supervisors, etc.
> -Yes, but degree of reinforcement is limited by funding available.

The following evaluation summary of the telephone responses to the question of rewards for innovation confirms the questionnaire responses:

> In general, teachers agreed that administrations tend to encourage innovation. However, this encouragement comes in the form of the administration's laissez-faire attitude toward what goes on in the classroom, rather than in the form of monetary support. Teachers have a large area of freedom, if they are willing to buy materials or if they can find foundations that will supply the materials. But if the school must supply financial support, the encouragement is much less enthusiastic. One or two of the teachers mentioned that the encouragement from the administration for changes did not come about until parental groups had complained about what was going on in the classroom.

Questions in section B of the instruments attempt to more specifically assess the results of the efforts of the field agents and constitute the remainder of both documents.

B. AS A RESULT OF THE EFFORTS OF THE FIELD AGENT:		Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
1. Would you say you have noticed definite innovations in your department in the past year in methods and materials?	T	27	19	5	2	3	1.8
	A	19	8	2	1	0	1.6
Would you say these changes were greater than in previous years?	T	31	15	5	0	4	1.7
	A	22	8	2	1	0	1.5
Would you attribute these changes to the influence of the field agent?	T	25	21	6	1	0	1.7
	A	17	11	4	2	0	1.7

Not surprisingly, administrators tended to give the field agents slightly better marks in this area than did the teachers. Perhaps it is because the teachers are more in touch with reality and less conscious of the public relations advantage to claiming that change has occurred. Both teachers and administrators agreed that the changes could be attributed to the influence of the field agent, an agreement which tends to lend validity to the judgments of both groups. Representative teacher comments on question B-1 were:

-He has provided excellent in-service meetings and materials to implement innovations.

-The shower has become a downpour (information).
-Yes, he was able to persuade a publisher to underwrite the cost of testing new types of texts in American Government course--American Political Behavior.
-Mr. * * * has personally written over one hundred thirty pieces of correspondence for new materials and has made the material and replies available to all teachers in the area.
-Field agent's schedule, commitments to other schools and extracurricular activities make him relatively inaccessible to our teachers. Probably his biggest contribution has been in instruction sessions in group meetings of social studies teachers.
-Change due to textbook adoptions and curriculum more than presence of agent.

Some administrator comments in connection with question B-1 were:

-Mr. * * * has had only one unassigned period, and he has used uncounted evenings and free-time hours in this program. He has worked with the complete support of the Director of Instruction and at some times as a part of system-wide in-service programs.
-Somewhat, although we all felt his influence as a teacher.
-I should mention here that I have one teacher who had her "mind blown" over the teachers around her who are trying some new methods and has been out of school for 4 months because of it.
-Enthusiastic "soft" sell approach has found buyers.
-Department chairmen and individual teachers have publicly stated this.
-Our agent...has been a superb resource. The social studies faculty has changed because of his efforts.
-Simulation games and team planning have been strengthened in the areas of "slow learners" by "input" of field agent. Articulation between junior high and high school has been strengthened by sequential planning.
-A most dynamic field agent has sold the program and is making it go.
-The field agent is responsible for most of the change.

The telephone follow-up on question B-1 was as follows:

> All teachers responded that they had noticed definite changes in the availability of new materials in the past year. However, some said that, even though they were aware of the new materials, they had not been able to employ the new material because money was a problem. All the teachers answered that they had utilized some of the new materials, and they agreed that they had used them more than in previous years. As to the evaluation of new materials, the responses covered the entire spectrum from very bad to very good, but the majority of the teachers agreed that the materials were getting better and that they were quite good right now. When asked whether they knew of other teachers who had used the new materials, the teachers all agreed that other teachers were using them. Some teachers even mentioned teachers in other departments, such as English and math, that had been stimulated to use new materials because of what was going on in the social studies program. When asked whether the teachers felt that these changes were a result of the efforts of the field agent, again the whole spectrum appeared from definitely yes to definitely no. Only one teacher said that the field agent was not at all responsible for the change that had occurred. Most agreed that the field agent had had some input into the program and that the field agent had done a good job of creating awareness of the materials.

Question B-2 focused on the availability of the new social studies materials and the field agents' role in that activity.

			Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
2.	Do you feel that new social studies products and practices are more easily obtainable now than in the past?	T	27	23	2	3	1	1.7
		A	16	9	5	2	2	2.0
	Do you feel that this is a direct result of the efforts of the field agent? *	T	24	21	6	3	1	1.8

*This question did not appear on the administrator questionnaire.

Though the difference between the teacher (1.7) and the administrator (2.0) means is small, it may reveal the differing perspectives of the two groups concerning the availability of materials. Since field agents returned to their schools with many social studies materials in their kits, it may have appeared to teachers that there was indeed an increase in the range and availability of materials. On the other hand, administrators might have seen that the materials budget for the social studies department was not increasing (in many cases it could not because of budgetary limitations) and thus concluded that there was not as great an increase in the availability of materials as the teachers saw from their vantage point.

The following teacher comments seem to say that when the field agent does not actually have the materials, he at least knows where to get them.

-Our field agent is involved to such an extent in other things and inclined to be rather absent-minded, that he has been known to forget to share materials. This is <u>not</u> criticism of his intent.
-Although materials are available, knowing where to find them is the key and our agent knows that job.
-Yes, I have learned how to get many free materials that were escaping me before.
-He knows.
-We know where they are! We are working on how to get them.

The administrators commented:

-Field agents have provided most of them.
-Agent knows what, where, and how.
-We have supplied everything requested, I believe. This has not been a problem in other years.
-The agent knows exactly how to obtain these newer materials.
-Information about these and sample materials; materials for extensive use, no.

It generally appears that the field agents were successful in making a greater range of curriculum materials available to teachers. Certainly the availability of materials is a crucial first step in creating an awareness of them. Such an awareness is reflected in the responses to the first part of item B-3.

			Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
3.	Have you been made more aware of the "new social studies?"	T	29	17	5	3	1	1.7
	Do you feel "committed" to the innovations of which you have become aware?	T	19	18	11	1	3	2.1

Teacher responses to part two of question B-3 seem to indicate a cautious attitude toward the new materials and their accompanying teaching strategies. A larger than usual number of respondents (11) chose a middle ground response and a sample of the teacher comments

to this question also confirms this cautious attitude.

> -I still have an open mind about those of which I am aware. I feel that some of these methods are still experimental and have to be modified for use in the large classes of today.
> -We are moving with caution. There are many things on the market.
> -I have always been committed to new and innovative teaching. Flexibility is my personal thing.
> -Yes, simply from the standpoint that traditional methods seem to turn off many students and inquiry approaches at least get most students involved, reacting and thinking.

Telephone interviews likewise turned up this same "go slow" attitude.

> The teachers agreed that more teachers were aware now of what it means to be an inquiry-type teacher. They mentioned, however, that some teachers were afraid to try it in their classrooms. Several teachers who had tried the inquiry method said it was good with their fast class, but it could not be used profitably with a slow or an average class.

It is obvious that despite the best efforts of the field agents, teachers are reluctant to commit themselves to the innovations in social studies. Such a stance is not necessarily bad since the pursuit of educational fads would be impeded by a "show me the evidence that it works" attitude on the part of adopters. One wonders if the reluctance to commit is at all related to a desire for empirical evidence of the innovations' effectiveness. Other evaluation data do not support such an assumption though

Havelock describes the very useful function performed by the "defender" role.*

			Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
4.	Have you become aware of what it means to be an inquiry-type teacher (such as from a demonstration lesson)?	T	26	18	8	1	1	1.8
	Do you feel this type of teaching is effective?	T	22	16	13	4	0	2.1

Question B-4 asked whether teachers knew what it meant to be an inquiry teacher and whether or not they felt this type of teaching was effective. Supposedly one of the general ideas that field agents were promoting was a greater commitment to inquiry types of materials and teaching strategies. One must really doubt the validity of the answers to such a question since the definitions of inquiry teaching vary greatly. What the potential adopter perceives as inquiry teaching may not, in fact, be that at all; but, whatever the teachers saw, it was different enough from what they were accustomed to for them to have reservations about its effectiveness. Teachers commented:

-I was always an inquiry-type teacher. I do not

---

* Ronald G. Havelock. PLANNING FOR INNOVATIONS THROUGH DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE. Institute for Social Research. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. pp. 1-1, 1-2.

feel it is effective with slow students.
-There is nothing more deadly than continued inquiry teaching. It has its place, but not a daily diet. This turns the kids off as much as continual text teaching.
-Yes, except that I do not think that it should be used exclusively.
-Yes, but to do this the students do not learn as much factual knowledge as in lecture/demonstration.

As with the new materials, teachers are cautious. The field agent training program advised the field agents to, as much as possible, always ground the theoretical inquiry model in specific materials designed for student use in the hope that such examples would help clarify the concept. The training program was never designed to prepare the field agents to teach others how to use inquiry as a teaching style, though some of the field agents were called upon to do just that. The telephone interviews confirmed that the teachers knew of the demonstration lessons and some of those interviewed even expressed resentment at not having more such demonstrations.

Question B-5 asked teachers if they had asked the field agent to teach a demonstration lesson or display new materials. Over 50% of the respondents answered with a definite yes and 24 of the 30 said the results had been satisfactory.

			Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
5.	Have you ever contacted the field agent to teach a demonstration lesson or to display new materials?	T	30	10	0	3	9	2.1
	Were the results satisfactory?	T	24	13	3	2		1.6

Teachers commented as follows:

-Excellent--he also brought in publishers' people, expert in the APB materials for an entire day.
-Mr. * * * gave at least two demonstration lessons at the in-service program for social studies teachers.
-At faculty meetings (departmental) demonstration lessons and materials have been presented.
-A new game concerning cities was used in one of my classes.
-Results were satisfactory only to those teachers who desired something new.
-He assisted me with a lesson.

Thus field agents did teach demonstrations and generally with satisfying results. One must remember, however, that the teachers were cautious in admitting commitment to what they saw and heard. One way to test the effectiveness of demonstrations is to see how many teachers decide to try some of the new curriculum materials. Question B-6 probes in this area.

			Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
6.	Have you decided to try any new social studies curriculum materials?	T	39	8	3	0	2	1.4
	Were you able to conduct simple evaluations of such	T	21	9	7	4	3	2.1

		Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
try-outs with the field agent's assistance?	T	21	9	7	4	3	2.1
Was your reaction to these try-outs favorable?	T	19	12	8	0	0	1.7

Typical teacher comments were:

-Textbooks were given to us after adoption. Teachers had little say (except a few on curriculum council) on choice.
-Simulation games in government helped my class understand state legislature.
-We were previously committed to some of these programs and materials.
-He advised me on the choice of materials to be added to our department for this year (1971-72).

To have 39 of the 55 teachers indicate that they had decided to try new curriculum materials is a significant factor, as is the fact that 21 of those who tried them reacted favorably to the experience. In a sense, all one can ask of a diffuser is that he move the innovation to the trial state. Failure to adopt after a trial may, in fact, indicate a wise decision on the part of the adopter rather than a breakdown in diffusion. Question B-6, of course, provides no data concerning a final adoption decision.

			Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
7.	Have you ever received special help from a resource person or outside person?	T	35	6	2	2	8	1.9
	Was this assistance helpful?	T	31	7	5	2	1	1.6

It is difficult to interpret question B-7 since it is not clear that the field agent was, in fact, the resource person being referred to. What is significant is that about 63% of the teachers responding had had some type of help during the year. This is probably unusually high since most teachers report that their job is indeed a lonely one.

Question B-8 was an important one in terms of the follow-up year objectives. The philosophy of the field agent program included the notion that one of the field agents' primary objectives was to work themselves out of a job by helping their colleagues learn how to get along without them. One of the many ways to accomplish this was to raise the level of their sophistication concerning the selection of materials. Again, while one must depend upon the teachers' self-perceptions of their abilities, question B-8 seems to indicate that almost 50% of those responding felt this

was the case.

			Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
8.	Do you feel you have become a more critical consumer of new social studies products?	T	24	19	6	1	3	1.9

Question B-9 also probed for information in an area considered crucial by the program Co-directors. One of the characteristics of a field agent is his wide acquaintance with resources, both material and human. In fact, it is a capability summed up by people feeling "he is the person to see about..."

			Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
9.	Would you characterize the field agent as "the person to see about what is going on in social studies?"	T	39	13	2	1	1	1.4
		A	25	4	0	2	2	1.5
	If not, what are the names of people at this school whom you could contact about social studies materials and teaching problems?							

Teachers and administrators both felt that the field agents had developed the hoped-for image. In this

case, client perceptions are a valid indicator since they are the basis upon which the potential adopter makes the first contact with the diffuser. When teachers listed other persons (part two of the question), they most often mentioned their department chairmen or social studies supervisor in those systems where the field agents did not hold that role. The telephone interviews were summarized as follows:

> Some teachers felt that the field agent was "the" person to see, however the majority responded that he was "a" person to see. The other person usually mentioned was the department head, and some teachers felt that they themselves could get the information by doing their own research. One teacher did respond that he has been firmly instructed to go to the department head for assistance and not to go to the field agent. All the teachers agreed that no one person was more helpful than the field agent, though some felt that there were one or two persons who were just as helpful.

Given the fact that field agents were often in competition with persons in official positions where they were supposed to be well informed and helpful in the area of social studies, the field agents did quite well in establishing their reputations.

			Frequencies					Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	
10.	Would you say the field agent has been instrumental in effecting change in your school?	T	28	15	4	5	2	1.8
		A	15	14	4	1	0	1.7

		Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Do you feel that the effect of the work of the field agent has been generally positive?	A	25	4	3	2	0	1.5

If there was a make-or-break question in the evaluation, this one is it. Whatever else the field agent had done could be summarized by question B-10 (B-3 on the administrator questionnaire). Because of the question's importance all teacher and administrator comments are given.

Teachers

-With younger teachers it is often easier to introduce innovations. It becomes more difficult with those who have had many years of experience.
-In my opinion he has offered new ideas to all the teachers.
-The program was initially established by the Board of Education. Our field agent has aided us in changing from the old concept to the new.
-Has been instrumental in a quick, desirable change in our system's American history and government courses.
-More change in attitude than anything else.
-He does a lot of traveling to local schools and works very hard with other teachers.
-Again, he has offered; few have accepted.
-We are planning an entirely new approach to social studies next year that should make things exciting for teachers and students.
-Change in our school is controlled by supply of money.
-Not really.
-Due to his effort there is much more material available than ever before.
-He has been highly effective with some, somewhat effective with others, and ineffective with a few.
-I think it's hard for our agent to change our curriculum since social studies is merged with

language arts and our agent's area isn't language arts but social studies.
-In the social science department.
-Was very helpful to one new teacher who has since switched to science, taking methods along with much success. Has been available (within time limits) for consultation. However, much change was also brought about by change in text and county approach. I found meetings with field agent helpful.
-He has given me materials to use; I'm changing my methods; this is not school wide, but it is a beginning. This is why I rate this question with a 1.
-I believe so, but we'll know more next fall, if some of our programs are accepted by the Board of Education.

Administrators

-In his classes.
-The fact that he has had time to visit teachers and work with them has been most helpful.
-Much more progress has been made this year in the Middle Schools than in other years.
-His difficulty arises from being spread too thin between elementary and secondary. Also some teachers are married to the textbook.
-I am not able to say how much the Junior Highs have gained. Next year's second Senior High will be greatly helped.
-Effecting change is a slow process. His presence has insured that change can take place and in a sound educational nature. To effect change, more than six months is necessary.
-He has done an outstanding job.
-The field agent has affected change in the schools in which he has worked. He has also helped in county-wide in-service meetings.

From the point of view of those most closely involved, the field agents were indeed credited with having helped change things in their schools. As indicated by the second part of the question and the teacher and

administrator comments which follow it, field agents were generally able to promote change while maintaining good public relations.

		Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Would you say his public relations in attempting to implement change have been positive?	T	33	17	6	0	0	1.7
	A	21	5	5	2	0	1.6

Teachers

-For the most part, yes, although in a few instances, he has not been too receptive of those whose programs and feelings are different from his own.
-Mr. * * * has been most thorough in explaining his program: he has given his time and knowledge most willingly to see that it is implemented successfully.
-He has met some resistance from the Curriculum Coordinator which is exasperating.
-We have a good Board of Education! Community relations excellent.
-Has used a soft sale approach.
-Time limitations are to a large part responsible. There have also been personal resentments due to what some teachers considered to be competition. (Game playing versus more formal instruction.) Other factors such as age, sex, etc. make this difficult to simplify.
-I think that public relations have improved very much over last year but some problems still exist.
-* * * has not "pressured" anyone to innovate; some "old timers" resent a relatively new teacher "telling them how to teach."
-Mr. * * * has made himself and new materials available to the area but the reception given has only been luke warm.
-Often the field agent, by offering a teacher a particular teaching item, has tactfully helped a teacher that was in difficulty about what to do with a class situation.
-Good P.R. man.
-Could have put out short newsletter. Doubt if all social studies teachers really know he exists.

-He has the type of personality and approach which make most people respond positively to his suggestions and ideas.
-Generally very much so. Some teachers fail to take advantage and then complain because they don't "get the word."
-The teachers were very impressed with our field agent and grateful for his frankness and forthrightness.

Administration

-Very little done in public relations except in-service training.
-There has not been quite as much dissemination as we had hoped. What there has been, has been positive.
-Still needs to work with "total" staff.
-He's tops!
-A very diplomatic approach has been used.
-Two school board presentations have been well received.
-Excellent.
-Most decidedly!
-A dignity and togetherness has been shared with the parents and community.

			Frequencies 1	2	3	4	5	Mean
11.	Would you say that the field agent has received support for his activities from the administrators in your school system?	T	35	11	6	3	1	1.6
		A	22	9	1	1	0	1.4
12.	Do you feel that the chances of the field agent receiving support during the next school year are good?	T	32	13	4	1	4	1.7
		A	18	6	5	1	1	1.7

The responses to question B-11 illustrate that teachers and administrators do not always agree on what constitutes support. Administrators, who may have been in the best position to know, felt that they had given the field agent stronger support than did the field agent's colleagues. The reverse was true concerning the probability of the field agent being supported during the 1972-73 school year, with teachers a bit more optimistic than administrators. Again, perhaps more weight should be given to the administrators' predictions.

As this report is written no data other than the predictions in question B-12 are available regarding field agent support for the next year. The problem is complicated by the fuzziness of what exactly constitutes "support." In some systems, it may mean sending the field agent to the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Convention in Boston. Other schools need to continue the field agent's reduced teaching load, and in two cities it means keeping the field agent in a social studies supervisor's positon. An important question for field agents in the spring of 1973 will be, "Were you supported in your field agent role to a greater or lesser degree this year than last?" In four cases this will be a meaningless question since one field agent will have returned to graduate school to work

on his doctorate, two will have assumed positions in different school systems, and one will have taken the job of State Social Studies Supervisor, pointing up the mobility of teachers in general and well trained ones in particular.

Teachers commented on question B-12 as follows:

-The field agent program because of lack of funds will probably be out next year. Our field agent did, I feel, a great job, but Indiana is in a financial pinch as far as education and the field agent program will likely suffer next year.
-Again, I can only answer for myself. I know I will be using more new materials next year, and he will have support from myself and my principal.
-Yes, I think so.
-If funds are available.
-Field agent leaving our school. Going to new high school at Bloomington.
-The field agent is well qualified and made a lasting impression on those with whom he works; therefore, he should receive the support necessary.
-I feel the field agent program has been a great success. Every teacher should have the opportunity to participate in such a program.
-Very good chance.
-Money too short; naturally the Board will feel this job is one of the unimportant ones!
-I certainly hope so.
-He will be at our new high school next year-- he will be heard!
-The extra school hour given to Mr. * * * seems to have vanished. Therefore what little support was available has vanished. It is a good program, and I regret the fact.
-Our budget is currently being cut.
-At the Junior High this would be especially true. It seems a bit more progressive.
-He is going into a new school with a new program and should be able to influence greatly the direction it takes.
-Perhaps more time will be devoted to special problems of field agents and teachers during the coming year.
-I suppose so.

The press of tight budgets can also be seen in the comments of administrators to item B-12 (B-7 on the administrator questionnaire).

-By being a part of a new school staff which will be utilizing entirely new approaches, the agent will be of great assistance.
-Like many other school systems we are looking for ways to "hold the line" financially and even cut back.
-I am not certain that our field agent will be returning. We would welcome him back.
-He will not be with us. He has accepted employment in another school corporation.
-Yes, but I doubt that one will be available.
-He will not be returning, otherwise, yes.
-We are going to try.
-Financial support may be limited but moral support will be unlimited.
-Money not available for extensive innovation in any area.
-Perhaps his time will be limited some because of financial pressure.
-May have to teach a full load.
-At this time it is difficult to say. I hope that it can be at least as much as last year.
-He will be in a new high school in this corporation with a new administration.

The random telephone interviews confirmed the results of the questionnaires regarding the possibility of support for the field agents during the 1972-73 academic year.

A few of those responding to the questionnaire took the time to write general comments on the program. Following are those made by the teachers.

-The effects after one year are good, but many of the new materials actually won't be put into use

until next year by many teachers. You should have another survey next year.
-Please understand that my critical comments are not directed at Mr. * * *. He is busy with Student Council, Photography Club and demonstrating in other schools, and our schedules do not meet for helpful conferences.
-The students feel unlucky if they were not assigned to him because he is the only one effectively applying the new system. The other teachers and I have a stigma to start with for this reason.
-My students do not like the texts nor the "new method" no matter how many variations I try. I will not tolerate game-playing methods too frequently. It's hard to change after so many years.
-This questionnaire took more than a few minutes indicated in the instructions. Shame on you!
-I have very little faith in evaluation questionnaires. This particular evaluation has not changed my mind.

Administrators commented as follows:

-The field agent project has been the most effective agent for change in * * *. If we consider progress in a single year, then we have been fortunate to be a part of it in the past 5 years.
-This has been an exciting year with the social studies becoming alive. Most students and parents are commenting favorably about the program. I hope it continues. We will do our part to see that it does.
-Given the limitations in funding throughout the district, Mr. * * * has done effective work. He has learned a great deal, and his effectiveness will increase within the next year as funds will be available for the first time in two years.
-* * * is a highly professional person, and he has been of worthwhile assistance in the launching of our new program this year.
-I am sure the field agent will be called on to help in social studies in-service next year, and I am just as sure that he will.
-It has been a pleasure to have the assistance of the field agent. This is a very worth-

while program, and I hope that Indiana University will be able to continue it.

In summary, the field agents' colleagues and administrators gave them high marks for the first year of work after the training program. The evaluation team, based upon their random telephone interviews with persons who had completed the questionnaire, was convinced that the data were valid. Certainly these two populations should have been in a position to judge the effectiveness of the field agents.

Summary of Site Visits

At least one person from the evaluation team visited each of the eleven field agents. During the visits the evaluators sought interviews with superintendents, principals, teachers, and the field agents. The site visit was intended to provide the evaluation team with some "feel" for the actual settings in which the field agents worked. The only changes which have been made in the evaluation team's report were to remove references to specific names of persons and school systems. The field agents had been promised that their schools would remain nameless when evaluation results were reported.

Following is the evaluation team's summary of their visits,

which were made in April and May, 1972.

SITE #1.

For this site there is no administrator interview since the administrator was out sick the day we were there. However, we did contact the field agent, and these impressions are the result of that contact.

At site #1 they have the use of a substantial resource center which seems to be well stocked with material. The field agent said that the teachers he worked with seemed receptive to change; they were willing to try new materials. One complaint he had was that they were not very critical of their materials; they would try anything if it were new. He mentioned that there were four teachers who were actively resisting his efforts towards innovation. The field agent at this site is responsible for planning the new high school's curriculum in social studies. He has conducted several in-services and several demonstrations and worked on the social studies curriculum committee which has been planning a model social studies curriculum. He did mention that he had been able to use his problem-oriented program, but only partially, and he was afraid to evaluate its effectiveness.

Most of his contacts have been informal, and he feels this is the most effective method of contacting teachers. His main contact with other schools in the system was through a model U.N. which had been conducted in the fall. Since the fall, he has not had many contacts with the other schools with the exception of the new high school which he is involved with continually.

As to the field agent's personal feelings, he feels committed to his role as a field agent. His main problems are time and money. He also feels that he needs someone to show him how to conduct evaluation of materials. He feels inadequate in this area, and he feels that he does not know enough about how to evaluate materials. As for changes in the program, he suggested that the schools' administrators should travel to I.U. at least twice to get more involved in the program. He also was desirous of having more in-services sent to him and some tapes which were prepared by I.U. With regard to the kit, he would like to see money built in for a five-year program.

He felt that his major accomplishments were creating awareness among the teachers, steps he had taken towards forming a local social studies council, and creating co-operation among the social studies teachers.

SITE #2.

We talked to the field agent and the principal of the junior high school. The principal is very supportive of the field agent's efforts, and the field agent here was fortunate in having quite some leeway to obtain materials. This school had the year before acquired a variance from the state textbook committee with regard to a science book that they wanted to use and which was not on the state list. This created quite a bit of knowledge in the school concerning the steps that had to be taken to get a variance. When the field agent decided to make use of new materials, he had a school that was experienced in bringing about change. He has taken advantage of this knowledge, and he has already set up several new pilot programs which shall be used next year in the school, and quite a few are already being used this year.

The administration seemed to be very supportive of the field agent's work and hopeful that his coming would provide an impetus for change, not only in the social studies, but in all other departments through the school. He has employed his problem-oriented program, and he feels the response is quite favorable. He seems to have made heavy use of outside resource people, including persons from Indiana

University, salesmen from publishing companies, representatives of national organizations, etc.

In the area of problems and suggestions, the field agent felt that he needed more visits from persons from Indiana University at his school to provide visible support to him and to increase his credibility with the administration and with other teachers. With regard to his kit, he felt that if he had it to do over again, he would put in less material for himself and more material which the teachers could use in their classrooms immediately. In terms of changes in the program, he felt that there should be more field work during the training year and that the field agents should be involved in visiting several schools across the country. He felt that funds should be provided for visiting special conferences, and that the program should provide maximum exposure to classrooms where new and different things were being done. He also felt that the program did not fund enough to logistically support the second year.

In the area of accomplishments, he felt that his major ones were in the dissemination of materials and programs. He used the demonstration lesson very effectively to get materials implemented. As he stated, his job as a field agent has expanded way beyond what he envisioned.

The principal at the field agent's school seems to be very much behind the field agent project. He did suggest more money be made available to the field agent, maybe even by paying a portion of his salary, so that the field agent could be given more time off from his duties at the school.

SITE #3.

This field agent is also department chairman at his school and social studies consultant for all the city schools. These several jobs have been of some help to him in that both he and his assistant principal feel that a title helps him get through doors and see other people and gives his suggestions more weight. It has caused some problems in terms of time. His assistant principal stated that he feels the downtown administration has not always used the field agent in the right way. He feels that the people downtown do not fully understand what a field agent is or what his role is. He stated that they tended to misuse him. The assistant principal went on to say that he feels this lack of understanding about the field agent's role has limited the field agent's usefulness in schools other than his. However, he feels this situation will change next year as the field agent has recently been made department chairman, and this should make doors open for him more

easily. The field agent himself felt that the several hats he was wearing caused him severe problems with regard to budgeting his time. But he also felt that the titles were a help in giving him credibility. With regard to special problems, the only one mentioned by the field agent was lack of communication between himself and the downtown office. He felt that the downtown office hindered change—that the downtown office was quite willing to speak of change but unwilling to take any action. As to his suggestions for the program, it was the field agent's feelings that supplying Indiana University with information of needs and desires was of limited help. He also suggested these changes in the make-up of his kit. He would put in more in-service materials and practical materials that teachers could use in the classroom. He would leave out much of the theory-oriented materials. As for the training program, he would spend less time in the academic area and more in the actual implementation, more in defining what the role of the field agent actually is. He felt that a shorter program would be suitable-- one which would concentrate on the implementation of change rather than discussion of theory. He also feels that he needs more free consultant time and more support from the downtown office.

SITE #4

These impressions are solely those gained from discussions with the field agent as the principal was unavailable the day we were in this city. The field agent feels that his role and that of the department chairman are synonymous. He believes that the field agent role makes up the job that the department chairman should be doing. Fortunately, this causes no conflict for him, since he is also department chairman. He says that he has internalized the role of social studies field agent and that he would continue to work in such a role even if he were not called a field agent.

In the area of problems, he feels that the administration has hindered his work somewhat, that the administration doesn't delve deeply enough into the curriculum, and that he would like to see the newsletter more often. He said he got only one all year. He would also like some information on how to go about tapping resource persons at nearby universities. Another problem has been a little bit of disillusionment. The field agent felt that change would be a lot faster in coming. He sees now that it is a slow process. However, he has also had some unexpected pleasures in that some changes have gone beyond what he expected.

In the area of changes, he feels that he would put into his kit materials more useful to teachers--samples that they could look at and materials they could use immediately in the classroom. In the program, he would have fewer political science courses, fewer economics and history courses, and more material on projects--more on how the materials were developed, how the materials were tested, how to use the materials. He also feels that the internships should be expanded, should be more intensive, and should be given more credit.

In the area of accomplishments, he has had a chance to implement his problem-oriented program, and he feels very good about it and feels that it has been very effective.

SITE #5

As a general feeling, the field agent is either in a very unique school system or he is not as far into the role as are other field agents. For example, every other field agent mentioned had knowledge of informal ways of getting around the formal procedures for getting new materials into the classrooms. The field agent at this site had no knowledge of any informal methods of getting new materials into the classroom. He seems to have been hindered quite a bit by his department chairman.

He also stated that due to money problems, he had been unable to buy much material this year. He categorized the amount he had purchased as very little. But he did feel good about the number of teachers whom he had convinced to try some new methods in the classroom.

In the area of problems, the one that really seems to stand out seems to be the department chairman. The field agent feels that this is partly because of the department chairman's philosophy--he is cautious and slow in bringing about a change--and partly because the department chairman is insecure and feels threatened by the field agent. Midway through the year, the field agent was placed on a committee with a curriculum decision-making power. He expressed the opinion that it was essential for a field agent to be in a position of power or to have the support of a person in power. As for accomplishments, he feels that in spite of the fact that he won't be within the system next year, he has converted a number of teachers and these teachers will continue to agitate for change even after he has left.

In the area of changes, he suggested that the training program should involve more practical use of the materials and should be less oriented toward the academic areas.

He said that half of the courses he had during the year at I.U. were poor, that the other half were good, but most of them were not applicable to what he is doing now. He felt the most beneficial program he was involved in was the program in which he worked as an assistant. He feels the practical experience in that program was very good.

He would like to see more follow-up on the part of Indiana University, more practical one-to-one experiences, more role-playing. One good point about the program that he mentioned was that the group consciousness among the field agents was strong, and he felt that this was important. He was the only field agent who made specific mention of the fact that at some time during the year he had been visited by one of the other field agents.

SITE #6.

It was evident that this field agent has good administrative support for his role, and that he has been quite active during the year in making contact with the other teachers throughout the system. He kept a list registering each time he made contact with another teacher and provided us with a copy of that list which seems to indicate contact with approximately 95% of the social studies teachers in the system. He seems to have more materials

available to him than most of the other field agents. It seems that the administration has been very willing to adopt materials that he has suggested, in place of materials that were state-adopted. The only problem that he mentioned was lack of time to keep up with all that is happening within his field. He and the principal both feel that one of his main accomplishments is the improvement of the program for slow learners. He also feels that one of his accomplishments is doubling the number of teachers who are willing to employ games and game-theory in the teaching of social studies. He has also arranged some major trials of new materials for the next school year.

He makes the standard suggestions about changes in the kit-- put in more materials that teachers could try out and leave out the academic reference materials which he feels were useless. He makes also the standard suggestions with regard to changes in the program. He stated that the academic part of the program was not helpful, and that there is a need for less theory and more practice in making personal contacts. He also suggested that a follow-up program in the summer would be helpful. He feels that the field agent should be teaching only one subject and that the administration should consider the field agent role or position as a separate preparation time.

SITE #7.

This field agent is a social studies teacher at a junior high school, and sessions with his principal indicate that he is doing quite well among the social studies teachers in the junior high school and in the elementary schools. However, the principal feels that he is not doing quite as well in the high schools. The principal feels that this is not due to any shortcomings on the field agent's part, but rather to the fact that he is younger than the high school teachers and that they resent taking any suggestions from a younger, less experienced man. The principal felt that this problem would work itself out in time. His suggested time period was ten years! The principal suggested some changes. Among them was informing schools about new materials in geography. This area was listed as the weak area in the social studies curriculum, and the principal feels it needs help immediately. The principal also suggested that the field agent program contain some work in public relations. He feels that this was a rather weak spot in the field agent's work at the beginning, though it seems to have ironed itself out now. One part of that problem will carry over to next year, however, since the administrative support, in terms of finances, will be less next year than it was this year. The principal felt it was partly due to the fact that the field agent was too self-critical; and that, although

he was bringing about good changes in developing a good program, he was unhappy because it was not perfect. Because he criticized himself so much and so often, this criticism tended to stick with members of the Board of Education who then gathered the impression that the program was ineffective and cut back the financial support. Another area that the principal would like to see changed involves materials aimed at the slow learner. He feels that many of the materials available now are good. He cited in particular a book in political behavior which he feels is very good, but he thinks that it may be too difficult for the slow learners to read. He suggested that some materials be put out for use in the high school for the students who read at the second or third grade level.

The field agent has been quite effective within his own school, but as the principal suggests there are problems with the teachers at the high school level. He says that he, too, has internalized the role of being a field agent, and his response is that the one who helps him the most is his principal. He also feels that approximately one-third of the teachers within the system are committed to the new social studies and said that he has used his problem-oriented program half-way, and that he feels the

most useful part of it was in drawing it up. He has three new sets of materials being used within his school this year. In two cases, these new materials are being used in place of the state-adopted text. And he is adding three additional sets of new materials next year. He was also able to arrange it so that next year all the social studies teachers at his school will have a common preparation time.

He suggests the standard changes: material teachers can take into the classroom and use immediately, less material oriented towards theory. In the training program he would like to see more firsthand practical field experience; he would like to see the academic material lessened, but he suggests that this might be quite difficult to do in practice because many might not participate if they do not get a degree. He also suggests that a little more initial guidance would be helpful at the beginning of the program in terms of what to put into the kit.

SITE #8.

This field agent is not in a school; he is working out of the central office. He is a supervisor, an administrator for the entire school system. He is obviously in a decision-making position. He has conflicting feelings about this. First, he feels that it is quite

useful, and it is the best way to operate in terms of long-range plans and long-range effects. However, he feels that the lack of personal contact with the teachers hinders him somewhat. His position also might hinder him from informing teachers about informal ways to get things into the classroom or in finding out about these informal ways himself because he is in one of the formal positions which the teachers will try to bypass if they want to bring about quick change. This field agent was in the happy position of having no money complaints. This position was unique to him as the school system had severe money problems over the last two or three years, but it seems now that things look quite good for the immediate future. His immediate supervisor feels that the field agent is doing a very good job. His one complaint was that although he is quite knowledgeable in the area of secondary materials, he is not so knowledgeable with regard to primary materials.

The field agent seems to feel that he is doing a good job. His immediate supervisor seems to feel that he is doing a good job. However, the two of them have never communicated this feeling to each other. One of his complaints was the fact that he has no feedback at all in his position--he does not know if he is doing a good, bad, or indifferent job. It seems to

be more the fault of the superior than it is of the field agent. The superior seems to be in and out of his office and is quite busy. The evaluator managed to get in to see him an hour after the scheduled time.

The field agent doesn't feel that anyone is hindering him particularly. His biggest hindrances are time and money. He listed his secretary and Dr. Marker as the two people who are helping him the most. His main complaint was the lack of feedback--that he gets absolutely none from Indiana University or his superiors within the head office.

It is hard to judge his accomplishments. He is not in a particular school, therefore he is not offering a classroom example to other teachers, and he is not in the school constantly so as to be able to tell whether or not other teachers are trying out new methods, but he seems to be starting out slowly with the intention of leading up to a big climax. He lists next year as his target year for getting changes into the classroom.

This field agent is unique in that he would make no changes in his kit. However, with regard to the program, he suggested more "doing" classes, more involvement classes, more working with the school

system during the training year, fewer academic classes, and additional consulting time from Indiana University. He also feels that the program was a bit too long. He suggests September to June as the ideal time, and he believes that the summer could be left for field work rather than academic work.

SITE #9.

This field agent seems to have quite good support from the administration of his school. He says that he is being used more than he had anticipated. Part of the reason for this is that the administration does support him and leans on him for information quite a bit. The administration said that the lowest grades on standardized tests were in social studies, and they are quite grateful for having a field agent there--they feel this will help bring about a change. He is doing a good job. He is not in a decision-making position, but he expects to be placed in one next year. He feels that he works well with all of the teachers, that many of the teachers have been converted or are being converted. However, he says that those who do not appear as though they will be converted feel this way because they are fearful of change, or of anything that gives the students more power. But he says in spite of all this, they have taken no steps to move actively against

him or hindered his work with the other teachers.

He said that one of the things he needed was a set of good pre- and post-tests. He feels that the publishers of textbooks could provide these, and that he needs them to provide some visible, credible evidence that the new social studies is as educational as the old. He also feels that one thing that would help him more in his job would be if the social studies department had a common planning time. He feels that it would serve two purposes: 1) to discuss classroom changes and 2) to make the department a more cohesive unit.

His work appears to have carried him beyond bringing about changes in the social studies. He has conducted several demonstrations this year. Both he and the administrator at his school mentioned the fact that people from other departments had taken part in each of these. The two departments which were specifically mentioned were math and English.

With regard to his kit, he would put in more materials that aid in giving demonstration lessons. He would put in more information on standardized tests and more books concerning games and game strategy. There was nothing that he would leave out of his kit. In terms

of the changes in the program, he suggested more field experience, and this could be brought about, he suggested, by teaching for nine weeks in a local high school. He also suggested that some class be formed which teaches field agents how to select and evaluate materials. He mentioned that this had been done in a seminar, but said he felt it had not been gone into in great depth. With regard to the I.U. support staff, he said he needs some visible support from them. He suggests an early fall visit. He also suggests a conference during the follow-up year which will involve the curriculum advisors, the school system's supervisors, and the I.U. staff. He mentioned that he had had only two visits all year, and both came at the end of the year and on the same day, one from this evaluator and one from Dr. Marker.

SITE #10.

This city seems to be the only stop on the tour where a real problem is currently present and visible. The problem is communication. The field agent has had absolutely no communication with his principal, and the principal feels this and resents it. This can be changed by the training program. The other aspect of this problem may not be able to be changed by the training program and that is the matter of race. The field agent is white; his principal is black, and many

of the teachers at his school are black. The principal mentioned this is a problem because the field agent gets many extra considerations in secretarial help. None of the other teachers understand why, and they are a little resentful of the fact that a new white teacher at their school gets these and they do not. Another reason that there are problems is that the principal is new at his school, and the field agent is also new. Neither one of them know each other, nor do they know the school. They have not been able to sit down and iron out those differences which have arisen. In spite of all these problems, the field agent seems to have done a fairly good job because the principal said he thinks the program is worth continuing for at least another year, and that he intends to get more deeply involved in it next year.

This site is also unique in the fact that two administrators were talked to rather than one. In addition to talking to the field agent's principal, we also talked to the social studies supervisor for the city. The social studies supervisor is a woman, and she is white. She has worked quite often and quite well with the field agent during the year. She is very positive about the program. This in itself has also hurt the field agent at his school, though, because the fact that he works

with this downtown supervisor is evident to everybody, and the fact that he goes to this downtown supervisor when he wants something done rather than to his own principal, creates more resentment. All of this leads to some doubt of the effectiveness of the field agent at this site. The principal said that the field agent had threatened several times to leave the school system, and then offered the opinion that nobody cared one way or another whether he left or stayed. The field agent himself said that he felt teachers saw him as an effective person, one who would agitate for change, one who was knowledgeable in his field. He said these feelings, however, existed before the strike which was currently going on. He feels that when the strike ends much of his effectiveness will have been destroyed due to the fact that he crossed the picket lines early in the strike.

He listed as his problems the administration and the school principals (the general category, no one in particular). He said that the administration did not encourage innovation, and that principals were men who were concerned with discipline and the making of schedules, rather than with educational reform. The unique problem he had was the teacher strike. He also said that department chairmen were a hindrance to him

(another general category--not any particular person). He said the department chairmen do not take responsibility upon themselves for bringing about changes nor do they take any action whatsoever. Another problem he listed was the union. He feels that the union has created much strife within the school system and has made the administration more reluctant to try anything new for fear of causing a confrontation. He also mentioned that he was getting no feedback at all about the amount of work he was doing. Part of this problem could have been cleared up by his own efforts, however, if he could have talked once or twice to his principal. His principal made a point of saying that in spite of the fact that the field agent's office was just a couple of doors down the hall, the principal had not once been invited in to talk nor had he ever come into the principal's office to try to explain what he was trying to do, nor had he ever invited the principal into his classroom to watch him teach.

In spite of the fact that he does not get along too well with his principal, he has instilled within the supervisor, the downtown administrator with whom we talked, a great deal of enthusiasm for the field agent program. He has also managed to get some materials adopted this year and he feels that he has made the teachers more aware of

things that are happening in social studies and more willing to listen to new people who come in with new ideas.

With regard to the kit, he would put in more simple games and simulations. He would put in more in-service programs, and he would put in more books on technique and fewer books on theory. He said that he would leave out of his kit almost all of the books on theory. As to changes in the program, he suggested reduced emphasis on the academic area, more experimental types of items, more in-services. Also, he would like to see the field agents being involved in more planning during their training year. He favors more role-playing in dissemination courses, less theory, greatly increased contact with the target school system during the year at I.U., and a stronger contractual arrangement with the school. He makes this last suggestion due to the fact that many promises were made by the school when he first came and that several of them were not kept. He also suggests a follow-up summer program of three weeks duration which would be a refresher program and one for extensive evaluation. With regard to support services at I.U., he would like to see I.U. maintain a collection of in-services which could be dispatched to a field agent upon request. Another change which he would like

to see is some feedback of the positive variety. He feels that it is a needed reinforcer. He feels that the program as constructed now contains much discouragement with very few rewards. The change that he wanted to stress was that more work be done with the target school system during the training year. He feels this is needed to help prepare the school system for working with the field agent. One last change he suggested was that more tapes be sent during the year to the field agent, letting the field agents know what is happening within the field. He also would like to see a written outline accompanying these tapes so that he can know at what parts of the tape certain materials are discussed.

SITE #11.

This field agent is one of the field agents who did not return to his particular school. He has a position working from the superintendent's office. We did not talk with his immediate superior as he was not available the day that we were at the site.

Since we could not talk to his superior, and because the field agent is not working within a school, it is hard to evaluate his effect upon bringing about classroom changes. He does seem to have established himself, however, as the person who the teachers turn to for infor-

mation with regards to social studies materials. He also seems to have had some involvement with community groups and has managed to get both the community and the teachers to listen to him and accept some changes. The only problem he mentioned was with principals who have hindered him.

With regard to the kit, he would put in more filmstrips giving an overview of the new social studies. He would put in more packaged in-service programs. He would leave out some of the professional books. He said that even he has not read all of them yet. With regard to program changes, he said that the social science component of the program was enjoyable but of questionable worth. He feels the program should also have increased emphasis on the development of in-service programs. Another change he suggested was refresher courses for field agents on alternative summers. He also feels that positive feedback is a necessity. Because he has received none from his people within his system, he has looked to I.U. for positive feedback, and evidently has found none there either. He did say that getting back with the group was important. For this reason he would like to see more conferences involving the whole group at Indiana University. He feels that when the whole group gets together, they can provide positive reinforcement for each other, and that one can look to the others within the group as resource persons.

V. SUMMARY EVALUATION OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES FIELD AGENT PROJECT BY THE EVALUATION TEAM

Through the various evaluation activities, the evaluation team was able to form a good general impression of the field agent project. Overall, it is evident that the field agents have been very effective and have progressed a great distance toward accomplishing the objectives set down at the outset of the project. In most cases, those who are influenced by the project, i.e., teachers, department chairmen, principals, curriculum supervisors, etc., react with great enthusiasm to this attempt at innovation. Any minor deviations from this general support are the exception, rather than the rule.

The field agents have been very efficient in disseminating information about new materials and in getting teachers to try them. Some have done better than others, depending on their particular personalities and situations; but, all have definitely created a new awareness and a willingness to try new things. Many times they have either been able to supply teachers with the materials, to put their fingers on a source of funds for new materials, or to suggest people to contact for advice or materials. In all cases, they

are mentioned (often along with department chairmen) as the persons to see for information about new products and practices. They are definitely recognized as resource persons.

In most cases communication is good between persons involved, although there are exceptions to this. There is some indication that there has been overlap into other areas besides social studies; that is, teachers in math or science have manifested a desire to try new things. Many have expressed the idea that the program should be expanded to include K-12.

One major benefit of the program is that it seems very likely that the field agents have developed a trend, an atmosphere, and enthusiasm that will continue in following years whether the field agent is there or not. (In four cases the field agent is leaving his school.) Some have established a regular newsletter to disseminate information; one is attempting to establish a local social studies council in his area; some have worked to get committees established to work on curriculum plans and objectives; and several are working toward, or have already arranged, having a common preparation time for all the social studies teachers in their schools so that ideas can be readily proposed, shared, discussed, and evaluated. Many of

the field agents have also arranged major trials for next year.

One of the greatest advantages of the project was having the materials available to put into the hands of the teachers. All of the field agents mentioned that this was the most effective aspect of the program. In cases where some factor, such as money, precluded the possibility of having the material readily available, the program did not go quite as well. It seemed evident that the majority of teachers were not interested in the objectives, advantages, or evaluative effectiveness of any of the new materials, but rather in the fact that they had something in their hands that would "get them through tomorrow's class." All of the field agents agreed that teachers certainly were not critical enough of new materials presented to them. Some of the field agents requested more instruction and assistance to give them a firmer background in evaluation; but, since it was also often mentioned that teachers and administrators were not really interested in that kind of information, it is questionable how beneficial it would be. It seems that a major shift in the manner of thinking and doing is needed. Perhaps this can come through the efforts of the field agent, perhaps not.

It was unanimously agreed that the most effective ploy used by the field agents was the personal, one-to-one contact. Some all but abandoned other means in favor of this one. One kept a record of the number he had made. These contacts definitely brought about the most results. For this reason, in systems which were larger or where the field agent was in an administrative position where he was responsible for many more teachers and could not have had the same degree of personal contact as a teacher within a school, the results were definitely not as visible.

It is apparent that the success of the project is dependent on the situation in which the field agent finds himself. To some degree, it may also be dependent upon personality, although in this case eleven quite different field agents have all been quite successful. It is not known whether this is due to an effective screening procedure, whether the training program effectively accommodates various types of people and enables them to completely internalize the role, or whether personality really does not matter that much.

The situation does seem to matter, however. It appeared that a knowledge on the part of the field

agent of the political situation in a school system and an understanding of how to fit into that system without making too many waves went a long way. All seemed to have some public relations problems at the beginning. Many were overcome, but some were still evident after a year's time. Often it was the older teachers who resisted change, but sometimes problems arose because of the field agent's lack of perception of the situation. The evaluation team felt, as one field agent suggested, that more contact with the target school system during the training year would be valuable. It seems evident, too, that it is essential that the field agent make it clear that he is there to provide an alternative. In some cases, his position was very threatening. One administrator even mentioned that he felt one teacher called in sick 24 days during the year just because he felt so threatened. In terms of changes in the training program, the same statements were heard over and over again. The field agents felt the program was weighted too much with theory, and they wanted more practical experience. All mentioned that they would put less material in their kits dealing with theory and methodology and more sample materials that they could give to teachers. Some thought that the program was too long, but that

one summer would be too short to become indoctrinated to the role. Several mentioned that a follow-up summer program would be helpful. It should be added that the conference held for the principals of the target school was well-received and very beneficial.

The major lesson the field agents had to learn was that change does not usually occur overnight. They returned to their schools very enthusiastic and expecting to change the world. They have made unquestionable progress, and that has been self-rewarding. Their experience has also been discouraging at times; however, some have been more disillusioned than others. One of the reasons for this was a lack of feedback. Many referred to the fact that no one ever told them they were doing a good job. Since many of them felt a role conflict, that they were making efforts in one area at the expense of the other, it is understandable that reinforcement was needed. Although they realized that the lack of time and personnel precluded a great deal of assistance, many felt that more visible support from I.U. would be very helpful and would lend greater credibility to the program and to their position.

As several field agents suggested, it is evident that the success of this program cannot be evaluated completely

after one year. Change requires time, and this program requires an on-going commitment and on-going evaluation for a period of several years in order to measure its effectiveness more reliably.

VI. LESSONS FOR THE FUTURE

After reading the preceding evaluation report one is tempted to ask, "So what did you learn? If you were to do it again, what would you change?" This final section of the report attempts to speak to these questions. It offers advice to those who wish to learn from the experience of the Social Studies Field Agent Training Program.

Selecting Participants: Obviously another training program should include women and persons from minority groups. Despite our best efforts at recruitment, our program included only white males. Perhaps this also says something about the types of persons school systems are willing to endorse for such a program. While the evidence is certainly not conclusive, it is possible that field agents should represent power positions, e.g., departmental chairmen, supervisors, local opinion

leaders. Even the field agents recommended this despite the fact that some were not themselves occupants of such positions. It should also be pointed out that one of the very effective field agents was young and relatively inexperienced, so the correlation between power and impact was not always a perfect one.

Having the field agent's administrators sign a letter of agreement is still a good idea, despite the fact that some schools failed to live up to every stipulation of the agreement. Two major changes should be made in the agreement. A dollar amount should be set aside for the field agent to purchase new materials upon his return to the system and a guaranteed reduction in teaching load should replace the 26 days of released time. Field agents were almost unanimous in reporting problems of overload and a day off now and then required even more work in preparing materials for the substitute teacher.

The Training Program: A full year is not needed to train field agents and a reduction in the time required can be accomplished by drastically reducing (or eliminating) the time devoted to subject matter courses. Video-taped role playing and simulations should be extensively used. Field agents should be given practice in using the available in-service

materials, evaluating materials, and other role-related behaviors. To the extent possible, competition for grades should be eliminated and specific attempts to build group cchesiveness and role identification and commitment should be included. Experiences should stress real world problems; and, if theory is employed, it should be tied directly to application and problem solution. If kits of materials are assembled, a basic "starter set" should be suggested by program directors with an emphasis on student and teacher materials, not books on how to teach or bring about change. Every effort should be made to insure that the persons who do the on-campus training also provide the follow-up support and repeatedly have experiences in the schools. The training materials currently under development by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Development for the preparation of educational information consultants should be incorporated into future field agent programs.

Follow-up Support: Despite the number of support activities provided as a part of this program, most of the eleven field agents reported a desire to have even more school visits, cassette tapes, phone calls, etc. Role insecurity probably was a major motivator for the requests for more school visits since almost

every request from the field agents for a visit was honored, the only exceptions being schedule conflicts. In addition, the Bloomington staff initiated about one-third of the visits. In other words, the field agents appeared not to have requests for visits which were going unfilled. Evidently future programs should plan two or three visits per year even if the field agents do not request them.

In a few places in the evaluation data the field agents expressed the opinion that they received insufficient reinforcement or feedback from the Bloomington staff, and/or their colleagues and administrators. These are puzzling findings in the light of the many visits, cassettes, phone conversations, letters, refresher/diagnosis workshops, and convention get-togethers of the field agents and support staff. This apparent need for frequent reinforcement underscores the tenuous nature of the new role and the apparent insecurity of those filling it. Evidently it would be difficult for future programs to engage in over-kill in this area.

Two types of field-oriented materials are in glaringly short supply and badly needed by field agents. The first is in-service programs that are well developed and tested. Just as teachers find it helpful to have

curriculum packages that include ALL the needed components, so too would the field agents have profited from complete in-service packages. The second is evaluation instruments which measure student growth in inquiry skill and attitude areas. A major reason that the field agents were not more successful in assisting their colleagues with the local evaluation of trial materials was the lack of ready-made measurement devices (and perhaps a very low felt need for such information).

Future programs will have to contend with another aspect of special programs such as this one, i.e., a substantial turn-over among those who are trained. Many are trained and then serve only a year or two in the new role before moving on to another position. Perhaps this mobility would have been less had the field agents been drawn from those holding supervisory positons, but our experience with such persons leads us to believe that as a group they also experience a good bit of mobility. This loss of trained persons is simply a fact of life with which future programs should be prepared to live.

The relationship between field agent personality characteristics and success in promoting change

is at best clouded. The original eleven field agents varied greatly in this respect and all experienced some success in the diffusion role. We still have a hunch, and it is only that, that very outgoing, low-keyed, bright, open-minded, and secure personalities would tend to be more successful in diffusion roles; and we will continue to try to recruit such persons in the future. Such a personality may not insure success in diffusing innovations, but it is our experience that it certainly makes the job easier.

One can certainly infer from the data that school system variables are considerably more powerful than field agent personality and style. The availability of support, both monetary and psychological, is a major factor in the degree of success of the field agents. The fact that in some cases the ONLY new materials available to the field agent were those purchased as a part of his kit (with monies provided by the Ford Foundation) is illustrative of this point.

We were aware from the outset that no one model of change would serve as the basis for the program. Our experiences confirm many of the notions contained in the R,D,D, and A model, but Havelock's Linkage Model now has much more meaning to us than it did in the

spring of 1970. However, we remain unchanged in our belief, now supported by even more experience, that with a very few exceptions local development of curriculum materials is not an efficient use of time or resources.

In conclusion, we have also had to ask ourselves if the Field Agent Program was a wise investment of our resources. Could we, for example, have brought about more change by making more individual contacts with schools than by training and supporting the eleven field agents? Should we continue to invest in providing follow-up support for the field agents?

Change is not an either/or proposition. The necessary innovations exist and perhaps it is time to shift the emphasis from development to diffusion. Indiana University-Bloomington will continue to support the Coordinator for School Social Studies and the Social Studies Development Center. Both the Coordinator and the Center can operate without the field agent component, but with reduced effectiveness. We believe that the field agent program has proven its worth as indicated by the data in this report. Our continued provision of follow-up support is evidence of that belief and commitment. We only hope that our experiences are instructive to others interested in change.

A P P E N D I C E S

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Coordinator for School Social Studies
101 Lindley Hall
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Area Code 812
Tel. No. 337-3584

LETTER OF INVITATION TO APPLY

Thank you for your inquiry about the Social Studies Field Agent Training Program. This reply has two purposes: to provide you with additional information about the program and to supply you with the necessary application materials and instructions for their use.

Perhaps the most efficient way to inform you about the program is to ask that you carefully read the enclosed brochure (if you haven't already done so). I wish to stress that this is more than simply a typical masters degree program. The three special seminars will be designed to provide participants with the knowledge and skills necessary to perform the field agent role. The seminars will be open only to those persons in the field agent program. In addition, participants will serve one-semester internships in three of the university programs that specifically deal with problems and topics directly related to the tasks later to be performed by the field agent. Again, these activities will be open only to persons in the program.

Another unique feature of this program will be the follow-up support provided field agents during their first year back in the schools. This will include a kit of curriculum and in-service materials, three two-day problem-oriented workshops, and site visits by various persons from the university. The sole purpose of the follow-up program is to provide assistance to the field agent as he plans and exe-

cutes locally oriented activities.

It is difficult to describe, in advance, the exact activities in which each field agent will engage. This will depend upon the agent's school situation and local needs and problems. Generally, we see the field agent returning to a regular social studies teaching post but also being provided with: twenty days of substitute time, the opportunity and resources to try one or more experimental curriculum programs, considerable regional visibility, travel funds to enable him to attend the NCSS National Convention and the state social studies convention (these not to be included in the twenty days fo substitute time), and administrative support for local in-service programs. The field agent will be able to draw upon university resources whenever appropriate. In short, the field agent will serve the role of a disseminator of information about new programs and practices in social studies, as a demonstrator of these programs and practices, and as one who stimulates and organizes change. The university fully intends to maintain close contact with the agents after their initial year back in the schools.

All participants will qualify for an MAT degree in Social Studies upon completion of the program. However, it is not mandatory that courses be taken for credit or that the degree be conferred. Each participant will receive a stipend of $4,200 plus $500 for each dependent. He will pay no tuition but must purchase his own books and classroom supplies.

If this program interests you, I urge you to apply as soon as possible. I suggest that you discuss it with your principal and superintendent (or his representative) even though I will be contacting them as soon as I receive your application. The deadline for the receipt of applications is May 15, though I suggest that you not wait that long to apply. Participants will be notified of their selection no later than June 1.

If, after considering the additional information contained in this letter, you wish to apply, please do the following:

1. Complete two copies of the Application for Graduate School Admission.
2. Obtain two copies of the transcripts necessary to show all of your previous coursework (undergraduate as well as graduate).

3. Using the forms provided, have three persons write letters of recommendation for you. This should include your superintendent (or his representative), and your principal or immediate supervisor.
4. Complete one copy of the Supplemental Application Form (yellow).
5. Discuss this program with your superintendent (or his representative) and principal so that each will be at least passingly familiar with it when he is contacted later.
6. Mail your Application for Admission forms to me as soon as possible; do not wait until your transcripts arrive. Instead, have them sent directly to me at:

101 Lindley Hall
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

I look forward to hearing from you soon. If you have further questions please call me collect at: Area 812, 337-3584.

Sincerely,

Gerald W. Marker
Co-Director

GWM/jb

Enclosures

LETTER OF AGREEMENT

Gentlemen:

A few days ago I received a completed application for the Social Studies Field Agent Training Program (see enclosed brochure) from _____. The purpose of this letter is to give you additional information about the benefits and obligations connected with your school system's participation in this program, if and when _____ is selected.

First, let me outline how I think the field agents will be different from the graduates of our other masters degree program. In addition to having completed twenty-four hours of social science work, the field agent will return to his school as one who:

1. is knowledgeable about, and can demonstrate, the "new social studies."

2. has a kit of in-service materials which have been developed specifically to assist in the solution of local problems.

3. has learned how to assist his colleagues and superiors in bringing about change at the local level.

4. will be available to the system, and perhaps others in the area for sustained follow-up, as opposed to the typical university change advocate who is there one day and then leaves.

5. will be thoroughly familiar with and able to draw upon the many university resources which are related to the social studies area.

6. will receive continuing support and assistance from the university during the year following his return to the school system.

To put it another way, the U.S. Office of Education

is investing a considerable amount of money in each of these eleven field agents in an effort to see if change in the social studies at the local level can be facilitated. Because the field agent will have special kinds of competencies that will make it possible for him to play a somewhat unique role, we are asking the field agent's school system to also make some unusual commitments to the program, as follows:

1. Grant the field agent a leave of absence for the 1970-71 school year.

2. Furnish the field agent with twenty-six days of substitute time during the 1971-72 school year. In addition, allow the field agent the necessary extra days to attend the annual convention for the State Social Studies Council. Six of the twenty-six days will be used by the field agent to return to Indiana University for three two-day refresher/diagnosis workshops. The remaining twenty days will be used for the field agent to run locally oriented programs. These will, of course, be planned jointly by the field agent and others in his school system.

3. Allow the field agent to experiment with at least one class in which he will use curriculum materials from one of the social studies projects. The school will agree to buy a classroom set of these materials.

4. Give the field agent support and visibility upon his return in the fall of 1971, e.g., make it possible for the field agent to describe his work to the PTA and faculty meetings.

5. Place the field agent on curriculum committees, in the role of department chairman, etc., whenever appropriate. In other words, the field agent is placed in positions where his special training can best be utilized.

6. Provide travel funds for the field agent to attend the three refresher/diagnosis workshops to be held in Bloomington during the follow-up year, 1971-72.

7. Provide travel and per diem for the field agent to the NCSS Annual Convention and the

State Social Studies Council Convention.

8. The superintendent (or his representative) and the principal of the field agent's school agree to return to Bloomington twice during the training year for conferences dealing with various aspects of the Field Agent Program.

I realize that we are asking the field agent's system to make a considerable contribution to this program. I hope you will agree with me that the benefits that the system stands to receive will more than offset these additional obligations. If you have any questions about them please give me a call. If these conditions seem reasonable, would you each make a copy of this letter, sign that copy, and return it to me as soon as possible in order that each may be placed in _____'s folder. Applicants of schools agreeing to these conditions will receive preference in the selection process.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Gerald W. Marker
Co-Director

GWM: jb

Enclosure

INDEX TO FIELD AGENT INFORMATION TAPE #2

0 - 20	General Informational Information
20 - 22	Focus on Asian Studies
22 - 26	Bibliography of Resources on Racial and Ethnic Minorities for Pennsylvania Schools
26 - 30	Individualization in Schools
30 - 31	Headline Series "Rethinking Economic Development"
31 - 32	Thorne Films 8 mm Documentary Series
32 - 36	ASCD Project Index
36 - 38	From Subject to Citizen
38 - 45	New games from Interact
45 - 49	MACOS Newsletter
49 - 51	February meeting
51 - 52	Up-coming field visits
52 - 53	Learning in Small Groups
53 - 54	General remarks & greetings from those of us here
54 - 55	Winnetka Institute
55 - 56	Game: "Marketplace"
56 - 58	Ethnic Studies Materials
58 - 70	Inquiry Lab Practice Manuals

INDEX TO FIELD AGENT INFORMATION TAPE #3

April 7, 1972

0 - 15	News about the office and coordinator's position.
15 - 20	Status report on the outside evaluation.
20 - 22	Indiana Council for the Social Studies Annual Convention news.
22 - 27	Field Agent Slide Tape.
27 - 50	Details on the May Refresher/Diagnosis Workshop.
50 - 52	Picture lists.
52 - 54	Global Dimensions newsletter.
54 - 55	New book by Shirley Engle.
55 - 56	Simulation/Gaming/News.
56 - 57	New Ginn Co. addresses.
57	Sign-off.

SOCIAL STUDIES FIELD AGENT TRAINING PROGRAM

A Project to Promote Change
in School Social Studies

101 Lindley Hall
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Supported by the United
States Office of Education
and the Ford Foundation

Tel. No. 812- 337-5272
337-3584

May 11, 1972

SPRING '72 LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS

Dear

This is a letter that I had hoped to write you about two months ago but was unable to do so because of the uncertainty regarding the future of the Social Studies Coordinator's Office. I am pleased to report that on May 3 the Chancellor of the Bloomington campus personally made the decision to continue the operations of that office and in doing so assured us that we could continue to provide follow-up support for your social studies field agent. As things now stand your field agent will be able to draw both upon the services of the Social Studies Coordinator's Office and those of the National Diffusion Project directed by James Becker.

I also want to thank all of you for being so cooperative in assisting in the third party evaluation of the program. It will be a few weeks before we receive the report of that project team but the informal feedback is that the field agents have indeed made a difference and many of you have testified directly to that point. I suppose the true test of whether you believe what your field agent has done for you this year is worthwhile is whether you decide to continue to support him next year. I realize that because of local circumstances you may choose not to continue all of the conditions which you agreed to in the letter of agreement which was in effect for this year and which most of you kept in good faith. The conditions that prompted us to propose that agreement still remain. If you are to get the maximum return on the investment that you have in your field agent you will need to continue to make a small invest-

ment in him. In one sense I suppose it's like revarnishing the gym floor every year or two.

We believe, and I think it can be documented, that your field agent is a very informed person in terms of what is happening in social studies, what materials are available, and how one assists locally in the trial and adoption of new materials and programs, of anyone in the country. I hardly have to tell you, however, that change occurs so rapidly in this and other fields that even a year without vital contacts can throw a person substantially behind. Sending your field agent to the National Council for the Social Studies Convention next year in Boston, providing him with travel funds to visit schools where innovative programs are under way, paying his way back here at least one time next year for another two-day conference, and continuing to lighten his teaching load so that he might devote time and energy to field agent activities will insure that the skills that he has this spring will not have vanished a year from now. In other words I urge you to continue to support your field agent the way you have this year in order that he might continue to serve the social studies teachers in your school system.

We will continue to do our part in this process of linking Indiana University with schools interested in moving ahead in social studies. We have indicated to your field agent that we welcome his phone calls for assistance and that we plan to make periodic visits to your school to talk with him and other interested teachers next year. We will continue to send him <u>News and Notes on the Social Sciences</u> and to make casette "update" tapes available to him periodically. As long as he continues to serve in the role of field agent we will leave the kit materials, purchased with monies from the Ford Foundation, in his possession to be used by him and other teachers in the system. If at some point in time he should simply resume the role of a regular classroom teacher or move from your system we will ask that those materials be returned to Indiana University so that we might make them available to another person who is willing and able to serve the field agent role.

Again I would like to stress the fact that we feel that this has been a most productive year and are confident that the results of the evaluation team's efforts will show that. As a group we think the eleven field agents are an impressive group of young men. Their commitment to the field agent role is one of the most gratifying aspects of this past year in terms of my own satisfaction

with the program. We look forward to another year with a continuing and strengthened relationship between Indiana University, your field agent, and the social studies people in your school system. I welcome your questions and comments about this past year or our future plans and say a final and sincere "thank you" to you for your continued support of this very important program.

Sincerely,

Gerald W. Marker
Co-Director

GWM: sh

Evaluation Program
Field Agent Project
Form #8

March 15, 1972

OBJECTIVE RATING SHEET

Listed below in random order are the follow-up year objectives of the Social Studies Field Agent Training Program. In order to determine if these objectives should be included or revised for the next training program, please evaluate them in light of your experience. In general, a 1 indicates a "highly desirable ranking of an objective and a 5 indicates an "undesirable" ranking of an objective.

1. Information about new social studies products and practices will be disseminated to social studies teachers and administrators in field agent areas more rapidly than would have been the case were it not for the field agents.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Field agents will build conviction about the "new social studies" among those persons with whom they come in contact.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Field agents will, in their own classrooms and in demonstration lessons, serve as examples of inquiry-type teachers.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Teachers and administrators will contact the field agents and ask them to visit their schools, speak to departmental meetings, teach demonstration lessons, display materials.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Field agents will speak to organizations such as the PTA, informing them of reforms currently taking place in social studies.

1 2 3 4 5

6. Field agents will convince some of their colleagues to try some of the new social studies curriculum materials and will assist in planning simplified field evaluations of such trials.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Field agents will provide the appropriate persons at Indiana University with information about the needs and desires of schools in their areas regarding new materials, consultant help, in-service training, and the skills and knowledge required of new teachers.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Field agents will execute the problem-oriented programs which they develop during the training year.

1 2 3 4 5

9. Field agents will secure the services of resource people needed to meet the needs of area teachers and school systems.

1 2 3 4 5

10. Field agents will gain the reputation in their area as "the person to see about what is going on in social studies."

1 2 3 4 5

11. Field agents will be assigned to committees and be given other responsibilities which carry curriculum decision-making power in their schools or districts.

1 2 3 4 5

12. Field agents will actively seek new contacts with social studies teachers and organizations in their areas.

1 2 3 4 5

13. Field agents will assist teachers in their area to become more critical consumers of new social studies products.

1 2 3 4 5

14. Field agents will assist schools in their areas in adopting new social studies products and practices to local needs.

1 2 3 4 5

15. Field agents will demonstrate their desire to keep informed of changes in social studies by joining local, regional, state, and national social studies organizations.

1 2 3 4 5

16. Field agents will conduct themselves in such a manner as to effect change without unnecessarily antagonizing those around them.

1 2 3 4 5

17. Administrators in the field agents' schools will provide explicit support for the field agents and their activities.

1 2 3 4 5

18. Field agents will be provided additional support during the 1972-73 school year by their school systems.

1 2 3 4 5

In addition, please comment briefly on the selection procedures used for the training program. Do you feel they should be changed, etc.

Comment:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Evaluation Program
Field Agent Project
Form #7

March 15, 1972

FIELD AGENT RATING SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS:

Now that you are completing the first year of implementation of the objectives of the Field Agent Project, we would like you to express your opinions on the training program and implementation in light of the experiences you have had.

Evaluate the following aspects of the training program from the perspective of its usefulness to you as a field agent this year. In general, a 1 indicates a high rating and a 5 indicates a low rating. Circle one. Additional comments will be helpful and appreciated.

TRAINING YEAR ACTIVITIES

1. Twenty-four hours of social science and history 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

2. S519: Seminar on Teaching Social Studies--Marker 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

3. R670: Seminar on the Sociological Aspects of Diffusion--Jwaideh 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

4. R590: Seminar on the Techniques of Diffusion--Jwaideh 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

5. Internship in teacher education with: 1 2 3 4 5

(Circle one) Smith Ehman Barr Mehlinger

Comment:_____

_____

6. Internship in the Coordinator's Office 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

7. Internship in the Social Studies Development Center 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

8. Colloquia (held evenings at Carole's and Doug's) 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

9. Demonstration lessons taught by the field agents 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

10. CMAS exercise 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

11. Diagnostic evaluation (done in the S519 fall seminar) 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

12. Diffusion plan (done in the summer seminar) 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

13. Thirty-minute video taped speech on the new social studies 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

14. Attendance at the ICSS Convention 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

15. Visits to schools with Tom Brown 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

16. In-service meetings planned and conducted by field agents 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

17. Stacks of handouts 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

18. Spring conference for administrators 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

19. Assembling kits 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

Evaluate the following aspects of your implementation. In general, a 1 indicates a definite "yes," and a 5 indicates "no." The other numbers indicate milder reactions, a 3 being a "not sure" response.

AS A RESULT OF YOUR EFFORTS:

1. Would you say you have noticed definite innovation in your department in the past year in methods and materials? 1 2 3 4 5

   Would you say these changes were greater than in previous years? 1 2 3 4 5

   Do you feel that you could attribute these changes (if there have been some) to your influence? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

2. Do you feel that new social studies products and practices are more easily obtainable now than in the past? 1 2 3 4 5

   Do you feel that this is a direct result of your efforts? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

18. Spring conference for administrators 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

19. Assembling kits 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

Evaluate the following aspects of your implementation. In general, a 1 indicates a definite "yes," and a 5 indicates "no." The other numbers indicate milder reactions, a 3 being a "not sure" response.

AS A RESULT OF YOUR EFFORTS:

1. Would you say you have noticed definite innovation in your department in the past year in methods and materials? 1 2 3 4 5

   Would you say these changes were greater than in previous years? 1 2 3 4 5

   Do you feel that you could attribute these changes (if there have been some) to your influence? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

2. Do you feel that new social studies products and practices are more easily obtainable now than in the past? 1 2 3 4 5

   Do you feel that this is a direct result of your efforts? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

3. Do you feel that more teachers have become aware of the "new social studies?" 1 2 3 4 5

   Do you feel that this is a direct result of your efforts? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

4. Do you feel that more teachers have become aware of what it means to be an inquiry-type teacher (such as from a demonstration lesson)? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

5. Have teachers decided to try any new social studies curriculum materials? 1 2 3 4 5

   Were you able to assist them in conducting simple evaluations of such try-outs? 1 2 3 4 5

   Do you feel that their reactions were generally favorable? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

6. Do you feel that your public relations in attempting to implement change have been positive? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

7. Would you say that you have received support for your activities from the administrators in your school system? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

8. Do you feel that your chances of receiving support during the next school year are good? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

IN GENERAL:

1. Would you say the social studies department in your school has made progress away from traditional (i.e., textbook-centered) methods in the past year? 1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

Evaluation Program
Field Agent Project
Form #4

March 10, 1972

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer each question by circling one number at the right of the question. In general, a 1 indicates a definite "yes," and a 5 indicates a definite "no." The other numbers indicate milder reactions, a 3 being a "not sure" response. Any additional comments you care to make would be appreciated. Thank you for your help.

A. IN GENERAL

1. Would you say the social studies department in your school has made progress away from the traditional (i.e., textbook-centered) methods in the past years?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

2. Would you say you have made more use of new materials and methods in teaching in the past year than in previous years?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

3. Would you say that this school system gives "rewards" for innovating?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

4. How would you rate changes in the social studies curriculum?

(CHECK APPROPRIATE PHRASES)

a. Give a teacher the opportunity to try new things _____
b. Often disregard proven teaching methods _____
c. Have been too slow in coming about _____
d. Overwhelm the teacher with irrelevant and difficult materials _____
e. Too often emphasize change for change's sake alone _____
f. Are attempting to institute radical rather than gradual innovation _____

B. AS A RESULT OF THE EFFORTS OF THE FIELD AGENT:

1. Would you say you have noticed definite innovations in your department in the past year in methods and materials?

1 2 3 4 5

Would you say these changes were greater than in previous years?

1 2 3 4 5

Would you attribute these changes to the influence of the field agent?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

2. Do you feel that new social studies products and practices are more easily obtainable now than in the past?

1 2 3 4 5

Do you feel that this is a direct result of the

efforts of the field agent?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

3. Have you been made more aware of the "new social studies?"

1 2 3 4 5

Do you feel "committed" to the innovations of which you have become aware?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

4. Have you become aware of what it means to be an inquiry-type teacher (such as from a demonstration lesson)?

1 2 3 4 5

Do you feel this type of teaching is effective?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

5. Have you ever contacted the field agent to teach a demonstration lesson or to display new materials?

1 2 3 4 5

Were the results satisfactory?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

6. Have you decided to try any new social studies curriculum materials?

1 2 3 4 5

Were you able to conduct simple evaluations of such try-outs with the field agent's assistance?

1 2 3 4 5

Was your reaction to these try-outs favorable?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

7. Have you ever received special help from a resource person or outside source?

1 2 3 4 5

Was this assistance helpful?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

8. Do you feel you have become a more critical

consumer of new social studies products?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

9. Would you characterize the field agent as "the person to see about what is going on in social studies?"

1 2 3 4 5

If not, what are the names of people at this school whom you would contact about social studies materials and teaching problems?

_____

_____

_____

10. Would you say the field agent has been instrumental in effecting change in your school?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

Would you say his public relations in attempting to implement change have been positive?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

11. Would you say that the field agent has received support for his activities from the administrators in your school system?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

12. Do you feel that the chances of the field agent receiving support during the next school year are good?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

Evaluation Program
Field Agent Project
Form #5

March 10, 1972

ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer each question by circling one number to the right of the question. In general, a 1 indicates a definite "yes," and a 5 indicates a definite "no." The other numbers indicate milder reactions, a 3 being a "not sure" response. Any additional comments you care to make would be appreciated. Thank you for your help.

A. IN GENERAL:

1. Would you say the social studies department in your school has made progress away from traditional (i.e., textbook-centered) methods in the past year?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

2. Would you say that this school system gives "rewards" for innovating?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

B. AS A RESULT OF THE EFFORTS OF THE FIELD AGENT:

1. Would you say you have noticed definite innovation in the social studies department in the past year in methods and materials?

1 2 3 4 5

Would you say these changes were greater than in previous years?

1 2 3 4 5

Would you attribute these changes to the influence of the field agent?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

_____

2. Would you say the teachers in your school have been able to obtain new social studies materials more easily?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

3. Would you say the field agent has been instrumental in effecting change in your school system?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

4. Do you feel that the effect of the work of the field agent has been generally positive?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

5. Would you say his public relations in attempting to implement change have been positive?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

6. Would you say that the field agent has received support for his activities from the administrators in your school system?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

7. Do you feel that the chances of the field agent receiving support during the next school year are good?

1 2 3 4 5

Comment:_____

_____

8. Would you characterize the field agent as "the person to see about what is going on in social studies?"

1 2 3 4 5

If not, what are the names of people in this school whom you would contact about social studies materials and teaching problems?

_____

_____

_____

_____

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON THE FIELD AGENTS

SOCIAL STUDIES FIELD AGENT

TRAINING PROGRAM

Indiana University--Bloomington

Meet the Field Agents

ROBERT T. ADKINS

Madisonville-North Hopkins High School, Madisonville, Kentucky. American history, government, economics, sociology, international relations, and world geography. Since the beginning of the 1964-65 school year, he has been social studies department chairman.

Bob received the A.B. degree from Kentucky Wesleyan College in 1961 and an M.A. in education from Western Kentucky University in 1964.

Bob and Judy Adkins have three children: Tony, age 7; Terri, age 6; and Teddy, age 2.

RALPH K. BEDWELL

Broad Ripple High School, Indianapolis, Indiana. Government, citizenship, economics, and American history. During the 1969-70 school year, he was tennis coach and sponsor of the school variety show. He has also served on the Indianapolis Public Schools Evaluation Committee, a joint teacher-administrator committee that developed instruments for teacher evaluation.

Ralph has both a B.S. degree and an M.S. degree from Indiana State University, Terre Haute. His major area

for the undergraduate degree, obtained in 1962, was social science; the major area for the graduate degree, obtained in 1967, was guidance and counseling. He maintains membership in national, state, and local education associations, and the National Council for the Social Studies, state and regional social studies organizations.

Until recently, his wife, Beth, taught English in the Brown County Schools. They are expecting their first child in late April.

JOHN A. HARROLD

Belzer Junior High School, Lawrence Township (Indianapolis), Indiana. Seventh grade social studies, non-Western studies and geography. He is also a member of the Belzer Faculty Advisory Board.

John has received two degrees from Indiana University-Bloomington, a B.S. in education in 1961 and an M.A.T. in social studies in 1967. He is an active member of the Lawrence Classroom Teachers Association, the Indiana State Teachers Association, the National Education Association, and the National Council for the Social Studies.

John's wife, Anna, also an I.U. graduate, teaches fourth grade in the elementary school at New Palestine. They have two children, a son,John, age 7 and a daughter, Rebekah, age 3.

DENNIS HORN

Wabash Junior High School, Wabash, Indiana. American history and civics. He has been chairman of the junior high social studies department and has been head track and cross-country coach at Wabash High School.

Dennis graduated from Manchester College in 1963 with a B.S. in social studies and from Indiana University in 1966 with an M.S. in education.

His family includes his wife, Carol, and his 3-year old daughter, Angela.

PHILLIP A. MATTINGLY

Meadowdale High School, Dayton, Ohio. American history, American humanities, civics, and social problems. In addition to his teaching assignments, he has served as acting chairman of the social studies department, advisor to the junior class, student council sponsor, and advisor to the Human Relations Council.

Phil attended the University of Dayton, David Lipscomb College in Nashville, Tennessee, and the University of Dayton in 1967 with a B.S. in secondary education. In 1970, he received an M.Ed. in secondary administration from Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio. He is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, the National Council for the Social Studies, the Ohio Council for the Social Studies, and the Dayton Area Council for the Social Studies.

Phil and his wife, Linda, have two young sons, Christopher Winthrop and Patrick Donnaker.

JAMES NAY

Columbus Senior High School, Columbus, Indiana. American history, government.

Jim is an Indiana University graduate with a major in social studies; he received a B.S. degree in education in 1967. He belongs to the National Council for the Social Studies, the Indiana Council for the Social Studies, the National Education Association, and the Indiana State Teachers Association.

Jim and his wife, Mary Lou, live in near-by Brown County where she teaches sociology, government, and economics at Brown County High School.

RICHARD SEGALL

Pulaski Junior High School, Gary, Indiana. Seventh grade social studies. He has also worked with Purdue University's program for student teaching in the inner-city and piloted his own revision of a seventh grade social studies course.

Dick transferred from Texarkana Junior College to Indiana University where he obtained an A.B. in history in 1967.

The Segalls have a daughter, Jennifer, who is 20 months old.

RONALD LEE VAN SICKLE

Marion High School, Marion, Indiana. Sociology, comparative political systems, and economics.

Ron is a graduate of Ball State University where he was a member of the university's honors program; he received a B.A. in education in 1969. He has done special work in social studies education with an emphasis on teaching the skills of value analysis.

His wife, Linda, is also a Ball State graduate, and a social studies teacher.

BRUCE D. SMITH

South Middle School, Grand Rapids, Michigan. Social dynamics. Before enrolling in the Field Agent Program he was social studies department chairman for his school.

Bruce graduated from Western Michigan University in 1965; he has a B.S. degree with majors in history and sociology. He has done additional graduate work at Western. For two and one-half years he worked for the Job Corps in Battle Creek. Included in his professional affiliations are memberships in the National Council for the Social Studies, the National Education Association, the Michigan

Educational Association, and the Grand Rapids Education Association.

During the 1970-71 school year, his wife, Mary, is working in the Spanish department at Indiana University and completing work for an M.A. degree at Western Michigan.

DOUGLAS WALTERS

John Adams Junior High School, Charleston, West Virginia. American history, civics, and humanities. His additional roles while at John Adams included the following: Student council advisor, yearbook advisor, drama club sponsor, and membership on the faculty committee for the National Honor Society. He was also head of the social studies department.

Doug is a graduate of Morris Harvey College in Charleston; he received a B.A. in political science and French in 1965; he has also completed several graduate hours in the political science department of West Virginia University's Graduate Center in Charleston.

HAROLD E. WILHOIT

Mt. Vernon High School, Mt. Vernon, Indiana. American history, geography, world history, and international relations. Along with his teaching assignments he has coached track and football, sponsored a world affairs club and participated in a project which counseled teenagers on probation from the state reformatory.

Gene attended Wake Forest College, and he graduated from Georgetown College in 1967. He has completed additional graduate work at Georgetown.

Gene and his wife, Becky, married in 1967, have a ten month old son, Christopher.

INFORMAL CONTACT REPORT FORM

WHO (e.g., Mrs. Smith, social studies teacher, Central Junior High School; Mr. Jacobs, Principal, North High School; Mrs. Brown, President, local PTA).

CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSON (e.g., opinion leader in senior high; leader of the "reluctant to experiment" principal group).

WHEN AND WHERE (date and approximate time, e.g., after school on September 19, 1971; lunch period, November 1, 1971).

HOW WAS CONTACT INITIATED (e.g., two weeks ago at an in-service meeting I suggested that I would drop by her room some day after school; coincidental, just happened into him in the lunchroom).

PRIMARY MESSAGE CONVEYED (e.g., discussed the Flanders VICS System and I described how I used it in my class and suggested ways she might like to use it; I told her about the demonstrations I was planning for next week).

WHAT, IF ANY, RESISTANCE WAS OFFERED?

HOW DID YOU RESPOND TO IT?

MATERIALS WHICH CHANGED HANDS (e.g., I left her my copy of THE ROLE OF THE CLASSROOM TEACHER; none.)

FOLLOW-UP (e.g., I agreed to video tape my class and to go over the tape with her next Thursday after school; I invited her to Tuesday's SRSS demonstration).

OVERALL JUDGMENT OF THE CONTACT (e.g., encouraging, she appeared interested and willing to give it a try if I would tape my class first; doubtful, seems as resistant as ever, we seem to talk past one another, bet she doesn't show for the demonstration).

OTHER COMMENTS:

FORMAL CONTACT REPORT FORM

(Formal activities are those which are planned well in advance, e.g., in-service training session, speech to a community group, presentation to a departmental meeting, all school faculty meeting, presentation to a local social studies council).

1. How much time was spent planning for this activity?

2. What were the dollar costs of the program and what was the source of the funds? (Does not include costs of released time for teachers, your time, etc.)

3. What was the size and composition of the audience? (e.g., 23 senior high school social studies teachers, four senior high principals.)

4. Where and when did the meeting take place? (Attach any programs which are available.)

5. How long did the meeting last? For what portion of the total meeting time were you responsible? (e.g., 45 minutes of the two-hour meeting.)

6. Were teachers released for this meeting? For how long?

7. What were your purposes (objectives) for the meeting? (e.g., to create awareness of and interest in the materials of the High School Geography Project.)

8. What was your role in the meeting? (e.g., I made a 30 minute presentation about HSGP materials and then introduced a colleague who taught a demonstration lesson using the materials. We both handled the Q & A session which followed.)

9. What materials were used, distributed? (e.g., all participants were given mimeographed copies of pp. 1-32 of Sanders CLASSROOM QUESTIONS and the attached work sheets were given to all participants.)

10. What follow-up do you plan? (e.g., another in-service on questioning is scheduled for March 23, and at that time all teachers have agreed to present their questions for each level of questioning. In addition, I will meet with Mrs. Jones, Mr. Brown, and the principal next Tuesday to show them the brochures on Minicourse #1, with the hope that they will agree to recommend that we preview with an eye to purchase.)

11. Other comments.

Name_____

Feb Mar April May June

Week 1 2 3 4

REVISED INFORMAL CONTACT REPORT FORM

1. WHO: NAME_____CHECK TITLE:

_____Social Studies Teacher in Own School
_____Department Chairman in Own School
_____Non-Social Studies Teacher in Own School
_____Principal/Assistant Principal
_____Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent
_____Curriculum Coordinator/Social Studies Supervisor
_____Teachers or Department Chairman in Other School
_____University related personnel
_____Other

2. CHARACTERISTICS

_____Innovators
_____Early adopters
_____Early majority
_____Late majority
_____Laggards
_____Gatekeepers

3. HOW WAS THE CONTACT INITIATED?

_____a. By the field agent

_____b. By the client directly

_____c. By a third person

_____d. It was a planned follow through from an earlier commitment

_____e. Accidental, it sort of just happened

4. PRIMARY MESSAGE CONVEYED--DESCRIBE

5. DID YOU MEET ANY RESISTANCE?

____Yes ____No ____Cautious, not either open or really resistant

6. IF THERE WAS RESISTANCE, DESCRIBE IT AND HOW YOU DEALT WITH IT.

7. IF YOU GAVE OR RECEIVED ANY MATERIALS, DESCRIBE THEM AND THE SOURCE.

8. DESCRIBE FOLLOW-UP.

9. YOUR OVERALL JUDGMENT OF THE CONTACT--HOW DID YOU FEEL ABOUT IT?

_____Badly

_____Slightly Negative

_____Can't Tell--Neutral

_____Positive

_____Enthusiastic

10. OTHER COMMENTS.

RESULTS: FORMAL CONTACT FORMS

1. Planning:

One hour or less	2
1 - 3 hours	5
4 -10 hours	3
11-40 hours	2
No response	1

2. Costs:

None	7
Slight	2
Kit Supplies	1
No response	3

3. Size of Audience:

Less than 10	5
11-20	3
21-50	2
51-103	1

Composition:

Secondary Teachers	238
Elementary Teachers	27
Librarian	1
Superintendent/ Asst. Superintendent	3
Urban League Representative	2

4. Where:

School	9
Urban League Office	1
Educational Park	1

5. How long:

2 hours or less	10
3-5 hours	3

Percent of program done by Field Agent:

100%	4
50 - 100%	1
50% or less	3
No response	2

6. Were teachers released?

Yes	9
No, voluntary	2
Not applicable	1

7. Objectives:

Inform of field agent role	5
Assess needs of teachers	3
Assess community needs	1
Provide information on text materials and games and simulations	8
Inform of resource people	3
Improve questioning skills	1
Solve problems related to use of new social studies, i.e., Fenton	1

8. Field Agent role:

Gave a formal talk	2
Informal speaker, answered questions	8
Administered survey	1
Gave a demonstration	2
Directed activity using games	2
Directed activity to improve questioning	1
Discussion participant	1

RESULTS: INFORMAL CONTACT FORM

September 1 to October 1, 1971

1. WHO

Social Studies Teacher in Own School	41
Department Chairmen in Own School	3
Non-Social Studies Teacher in Own School	1
Teachers or Department Chairmen in Other Schools	11
Principals, Assistant Principals	8
Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent	8
Curriculum Coordinator, Supervisors	5
University-Related Personnel	4
Data Processing/Research Consultant	2

2. CHARACTERISTICS OF PERSON

Eager, early adopter	18
Open, middle adopter	27
Traditional, but willing to change	2
Closed, laggards	3
Opinion leader	14
Unsure of self	5
Gatekeeper	9

3. WHEN AND WHERE

During school	51
Outside of school	10
Office	33
Hall, Teachers lounge	14
Meeting	3
Classroom	1

4. HOW WAS CONTACT INITIATED

By field agent	34

By client	15
By third person	7
Follow-up of previous commitment	3
Accidental	14

5. PRIMARY MESSAGE CONVEYED

General description of materials	22
Description of specific materials	17
Description of process	5
Discussion of in-service plans	5
Helping teacher with a lesson	2
General discussion of field agent role	24
I.U. resources	2
Interaction analysis	2
Other	7

6. WHAT, IF ANY, RESISTANCE WAS OFFERED?

Yes	5
No	42
Cautious	3
No response	10

7. HOW DID YOU RESPOND TO IT?

Persuasion	6
Specific help in overcoming a problem	3
Didn't	-

8. MATERIALS WHICH CHANGED HANDS

AEP	14
Fenton	4
Massialas-Zevin	4
From Subject to Citizen	1
Man: A Course of Study	1
The People Make a Nation	2
Classroom Questions	3
Clarifying Public Controversy	2
Instruction Objective in American History	1

Mini-Course 14 Information	1
Starpower	1
Black and White	1
Other	7
None	18

9. FOLLOW-UP

General intent--noncommitted	32
Specific plans	21
None planned-- or necessary	11
Closed on this, but opened another	2
Continued to prod	1

10. OVERALL JUDGMENT

Enthusiastic	20
Good	17
Seems positive	12
Questionable	2